VOLUME XLII NUMBER 4

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

OCTOBER 1949

À PROPOS DES ARÉTALOGIES D'ISIS	*A. J. Festugière*	209
DR. WATTS' "FLIGHTS OF FANCY"	*Robert Stevenson*	235
KIERKEGAARD'S SECRET AFFLICTION	*Arild Christensen*	255
"ONE HUNDRED FIFTY-THREE LARGE FISH" (JOHN 21:11)	*Robert M. Grant*	273
A NOTE ON EDSON'S MACEDONICA III . . .	*Herbert C. Youtie*	277

CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1949

Issued Quarterly $3.00 a Year Single Numbers $1.00

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Issued quarterly by the Faculty of Divinity in
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Editorial Committee

ARTHUR D. NOCK
WILLARD L. SPERRY — HENRY J. CADBURY
J. A. C. F. AUER — WILLIAM THOMSON

The *Harvard Theological Review* is maintained on the foundation established under the will of Mildred Everett, daughter of Charles Carroll Everett, Bussey Professor of Theology in Harvard University, 1869–1900, and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, 1878–1900.

The scope of the Review embraces theology, ethics, the history and philosophy of religion, and cognate subjects. It aims to publish investigations, discussions, and reviews which contribute to the enlargement of knowledge or the advance of thought.

Remittances and communications on business matters should be addressed to the *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.*

PUBLISHED BY THE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
PUBLISHERS OF THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON: GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Entered as second-class mail matter January 2, 1908, at the post-office at Boston, Mass. under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special postage rate provided for by Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 31, 1918.

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XLII

ISSUED QUARTERLY BY
THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY IN
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1949

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/harvard-theological-review_1949_42_4

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLII

NUMBER 1, JANUARY 1949

Baron Friedrich von Hügel and His Contribution to Religious Philosophy	*Clement C. J. Webb*	1
Light from the Quest	*Morton S. Enslin*	19
The Divi of the Hadrianic Period	*James H. Oliver*	35
Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture	*Robert M. Grant*	41
The Gospel Fragments P. Egerton 2	*H. I. Bell*	53
Another Parallel to the Maenadism of the Bacchae: Hasidism in Modern Jewry	*Louis H. Feldman*	65
The Middle Persian Inscription at Sar Mashhad	*Richard N. Frye*	69

NUMBER 2, APRIL 1949

Letter to Professor Arthur D. Nock on Some Fundamental Concepts in the Science of Religion	*Martin P. Nilsson*	71
The Name of Christians	*Elias J. Bickerman*	109
Eastern and Western Liturgies: The Primitive Basis of Their Later Differences	*R. D. Richardson*	125
Dante's Heavenly Rose: An Analogue or a Borrowing?	*Theodore Silverstein*	149

NUMBER 3, JULY 1949

Mana in Greece and Rome	*Herbert Jennings Rose*	155
Aristeas and III Maccabees	*Moses Hadas*	175
Latin Tractates on Preaching: A Book-List	*Harry Caplan and Henry H. King*	185
Monastics and Seculars under Yaroslav the Wise	*R. P. Casey*	207

NUMBER 4, OCTOBER 1949

À Propos des Arétalogies d'Isis	*A. J. Festugière*	209
Dr. Watts' "Flights of Fancy"	*Robert Stevenson*	235
Kierkegaard's Secret Affliction	*Arild Christensen*	255
"One Hundred Fifty-Three Large Fish" (John 21:11)	*Robert M. Grant*	273
A Note on Edson's Macedonica III	*Herbert C. Youtie*	277

INDEX OF AUTHORS

Bell, H. I.	The Gospel Fragments P. Egerton 2	53
Bickerman, Elias J.	The Name of Christians	109
Caplan, Harry and Henry H. King	Latin Tractates on Preaching: A Book-List	185
Casey, R. P.	Monastics and Seculars under Yaroslav the Wise	207
Christensen, Arild	Kierkegaard's Secret Affliction	255
Enslin, Morton S.	Light from the Quest	19
Feldman, Louis H.	Another Parallel to Maenadism of the Bacchae: Hasidism in Modern Jewry	65
Festugière, A. J.	À Propos des Arétalogies d'Isis	209
Frye, Richard N.	The Middle Persian Inscription at Sar Mashhad	69
Grant, Robert M.	Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture	41
Grant, Robert M.	"One Hundred Fifty-Three Large Fish" (John 21:11)	273
Hadas, Moses	Aristeas and III Maccabees	175
King, Henry H. and Harry Caplan	Latin Tractates on Preaching: A Book-List	185
Nilsson, Martin P.	Letter to Professor Arthur D. Nock on Some Fundamental Concepts in the Science of Religion	71
Oliver, James H.	The Divi of the Hadrianic Period	35
Richardson, R. D.	Eastern and Western Liturgies: The Primitive Basis of their Later Differences	125
Rose, Herbert Jennings	Mana in Greece and Rome	155
Silverstein, Theodore	Dante's Heavenly Rose: An Analogue or a Borrowing?	149
Stevenson, Robert	Dr. Watts' "Flights of Fancy"	235
Webb, Clement C. J.	Baron Friedrich von Hügel and his Contribution to Religious Philosophy	1
Youtie, Herbert C.	A Note on Edson's Macedonica III	277

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XLII OCTOBER, 1949 NUMBER 4

À PROPOS DES ARÉTALOGIES D'ISIS

A. J. FESTUGIÈRE

PARIS, FRANCE

A L'OCCASION d'une arétalogie [1] de Karpokrate, qu'il publie,[2] M. R. Harder a été induit à reprendre le problème des arétalogies isiaques, connues, comme on sait, par cinq documents du même type.[3] M. Harder pense que tous ces textes remontent à un original égyptien (H) traduit en grec. Un exemplaire de cette traduction, gravé à Memphis dans le temple de Ptah (M), est la source de Kymé (K), Ios (J), Salonique (S) et du texte en prose qui a servi de modèle au poème d'Andros (A^p). Un exemplaire du texte égyptien, gravé dans la fabuleuse Nysa d'Arabie, c'est dire en une ville inconnue, serait, une fois traduit, la source de Diodore (D). D'après l'inscription de Kymé, la plus complète, M. Harder reconstitue cette source commune de MD. On aurait là, pense-t-il, un écrit qui se révèle égyptien, non seulement par les idées, étrangères à l'esprit grec,[4] mais aussi par le désordre de la composition, trait proprement égyptien.[5] D'un mot ce document aurait été forgé par les prêtres d'Egypte pour exalter auprès des Grecs le culte d'Isis, que l'on présente surtout comme une bienfaitrice de l'humanité. La tendance serait "pro-égyptienne," et il y aurait lieu de comparer l'ouvrage d'Hécatée d'Abdère, sorte de programme de gouvernement rédigé

[1] Pour reprendre le terme adopté par Hiller v. Gärtringen, Syll.[3] 1267 (Ios). Sur la forme, cf. Ed. Norden, Agnostos Theos[3], pp. 177 ss.

[2] R. Harder, Karpokrates von Chalkis und die memphitische Isispropaganda, Abh. Berlin, 1943, 14 (paru en 1944), 63 pp. (J'ai eu communication de ce texte grâce à l'obligeance de M. L. Robert). Voir aussi L. Robert, REG, LIX–LX, 1946/7, pp. 342–345.

[3] Inscriptions de Kymé, Ios, Salonique, Andros + Diod. Sic., I 27. Textes réunis (sauf S) dans W. Peek, Der Isishvmnus von Andros, Berlin, 1930. Nouvelle édition de Kymé et Ios dans I. G. XII Suppl. (1939), pp. 98–99. M. Harder y renvoie à tort pour A: l'inscription d'Andros est simplement mentionnée p. 130 (non 98), avec renvoi à Peek.

[4] M. Harder s'en prend ici, à P. Roussel, dont l'excellent article (REG XLII, 1929, pp. 137 ss.) garde tout son prix.

[5] Sic Harder, p. 33.

du point de vue de l'Egypte et adressé à Ptolémée Soter pour lui recommander d'être un Bienfaiteur, à l'exemple des dieux égyptiens (Isis et Osiris) et des pharaons.

Cette thèse — car c'en est une — a au moins le mérite d'être nette et décidée. Mais elle appelle, semble-t-il, un certain nombre d'observations. Je me propose donc, après une remarque touchant les rapports de M et D, d'insister quelque peu sur les idées, la composition et le sens de ces arétalogies. J'indiquerai ailleurs [6] la place que tient en ce genre l'arétalogie de la Korè Kosmou hermétique sur laquelle, en général, on se borne à de simples allusions.[7]

1) M. Harder a raison de postuler un modèle *grec* commun à K J S A^P : la comparaison de ces textes le prouve. Bien que la fiction d'une stèle trouvée dans un temple soit familière à l'âge hellénistique,[8] il est même possible qu'il ait véritablement existé une telle inscription à Memphis dans le temple de Ptah (K *1*,[9] A v. 3–5) où, selon Diodore (I 22, 2) se trouvait le tombeau d'Isis. Mais pourquoi supposer un original égyptien, d'où dériveraient et l'inscription grecque de Memphis (M) et celle que cite Diodore (D)? Voici l'argument de M. Harder (p. 25). Selon Diodore (I 27), certains historiens disent que les tombes d'Isis et d'Osiris se trouvent à Nysa en Arabie et qu'il y a là, pour chaque dieu, une stèle "couverte d'hiéroglyphes." Il cite alors ces deux documents. On n'a pas découvert, que je sache, d'inscription qui confirme l'authenticité de l'épitaphe d'Osiris, mais celle d'Isis correspond à M *3–11* + *57*, sauf quelques variantes. M. Harder, d'une part, prend à la lettre le renseignement de Diodore sur l'écriture hiéroglyphique des stèles de Nysa, d'autre part estime que ces variantes sont telles que la version diodoréenne de M *3–11* + *57* ne peut dériver directement de M, mais oblige à supposer un texte différent, ce qui force à remonter à un original égyptien dont et M et D seraient, chacun de leur côté, la traduction.

[6] Rev. Arch., Mélanges Picard (à paraître).

[7] Ainsi Harder, pp. 50–51.

[8] Cf. Rév. H. Trism. I, pp. 319 ss.

[9] Ces chiffres renvoient à la numération en paragraphes ou versets usuelle pour les arétalogies isiaques. Pour l'hymne d'Andros, je renvoie aux vers.

Observons sur le premier point:

(a) Diodore n'est pas témoin oculaire, il rapporte le propos (*φασι*) de *τινὲς τῶν συγγραφέων*: la référence est au moins sujette à caution.

(b) La mention de l'écriture étrangère et sacrée est quasi de règle dans le motif de la découverte d'une stèle ou livre dans un temple, pour rehausser le mystère et l'antiquité, partant le prestige, du document: cf. Rév. H. Trism., I, pp. 319 (Evhémère), 320 (*lunarium* composé par des hiérogrammates sous Psammétique), 321 (livres d'Ostanès en "caractères perses" et impossibles à expliquer), 322 (Kyranides hermétiques écrites en lettres syriaques ou "étrangères").

(c) Après avoir cité les deux épitaphes (*τοσαῦτα τῶν γεγεραμμένων ἐν ταῖς στήλαις φασὶ δύνασθαι ἀναγνῶναι*), Diodore ajoute: "le reste du texte, qui était plus long, a été détruit par le temps" (*τὰ δ'ἄλλα ὄντα πλείω κατέφθαρται διὰ τὸν χρόνον*): [10] or c'est là, de nouveau, un lieu commun dans ce genre littéraire, cf. Ptolémée, Tétrab., I 21, 20, p. 49. 14 ss. Boll-Boer: "Voici cependant qu'il nous est tombé entre les mains un exemplaire très antique et en grande partie gâté (*ἀντιγράφῳ παλαιῷ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ διεφθαρμένῳ*) . . . [21]. La suite même du texte était fort longue et développée, mais difficile à lire à cause du mauvais état du livre (*ἀδιάγνωστον δὲ διὰ τὸ διεφθάρπαι*)." [11]

(d) De l'aveu même de M. Harder (p. 38), Nysa d'Arabie n'a jamais existé.

(e) L'épitaphe d'Osiris appelle les plus sérieuses réserves. Ce document, dont on nous dit qu'il remonte à "eine alte ägyptische Quelle" (p. 37, n. 7), parle des expéditions d'Osiris "jusqu'aux lieux inhabités de l'Inde, aux peuples situés au pôle Nord (*ἕως εἰς . . . τοὺς πρὸς ἄρκτον κεκλιμένους*: cf. Stob. Herm.,

[10] Notons en passant que cette mention est bien étrange en ce qui regarde l'épitaphe d'Isis. Cette épitaphe aurait porté, bien lisibles, les *personalia* (M3–11) + la conclusion (57), tout l'entre-deux, c'est à dire, 46 versets, ayant été effacé par le temps. N'est-il pas plus raisonnable de croire à deux versions, l'une courte, l'autre longue, d'un même texte circulant? Ce phénomène se rencontre souvent dans les textes de botanique astrologique: cf. Rév. H. Trism., I, pp. 143–145 (plantes zodiacales), 147–149 (plantes planétaires type *a*), 155–160 (pivoine). — Il n'y a rien à tirer sur ce point de l'épitaphe d'Osiris qui ne porte pas de conclusion.

[11] Pour d'autres références, cf. Rév. H. Trism., I, p. 320, n. 7.

XXIV 11 Scott), aux sources de l'Ister (Danube) et, de l'autre côté, jusqu'à l'Océan": qui ne reconnaît les courses du Dionysos hellénistique, calquées elles-mêmes sur celles d'Alexandre?

Voyons le second point. D diffère de M par (a) deux omissions: D n'a ni l'invention de l'écriture hiéroglyphique et démotique (M *3* b), ni Isis adorée par les femmes (M *10*); (b) une addition explicative: [12] *τοῦ νεωτάτου* Κρόνου D: Κρόνου M; (c) quelques variantes insignifiantes: *3* *ἡ βασίλισσα* D: *ἡ τύραννος* M || *4* *λῦσαι* D: *μεταθεῖναι* M. D est plus grec, ajoute l'article *Ὥρου ⟨τοῦ⟩ βασιλέως*, *Βύβαστος ⟨ἡ⟩ πόλις*, *Αἴγυπε ⟨ἡ⟩ θρέψασά με*, dit plus élégamment *ἡ παιδευθεῖσα ὑπὸ Ἑρμοῦ* pour *καὶ ἐπαιδεύθην ὑπὸ Ἑρμοῦ* (cf. Harder, p. 37). Si l'on songe que Diodore ne se donne pas pour témoin oculaire mais cite d'après *τινὲς τῶν συγγραφέων*, que donc le document qu'il cite, quel qu'il soit (copie d'une stèle ou d'un *βιβλίδιον*), passant par plusieurs mains, a pu subir de ce fait plusieurs dommages (notamment les deux omissions), que l'addition explicative *τοῦ νεωτάτου* peut fort bien être de son cru, on conviendra que les variantes qu'il présente ne sont pas telles qu'elles obligent à supposer l'existence de deux Harder: voir le tableau p. 39).[13] Il suffit donc de postuler traductions diverses d'un même original hiéroglyphique (H chez l'existence d'un seul modèle grec, qui peut être ou la stèle de Memphis [14] ou un écrit en circulation.

[12] *τοῦ νεωτάτου* Κρόνου ne peut signifier que "le plus récent," "venu en dernier" dans une suite de dieux. D'où vient cela? Isis est fille de Keb (ou Geb) la Terre et de Nut le Ciel, couple que, en intervertissant les rôles, les Grecs ont identifié à Kronos et Rhéa. Mais, alors que Kronos, chez les Grecs, est du nombre des plus anciens dieux, Krones-Keb, dans la tradition égyptienne relative aux dieux qui ont régné en Egypte, vient au quatrième rang, après Héphaistos (Ptah), Hélios son fils, Sôs ou Arès fils d'Hélios (cf. Joa. Antioch. [c.610–631] ap. Hopfner, Fontes, p. 730). Mais l'on voit aussitôt que l'épithète n'a d'intérêt que si l'on parle à des Grecs, pour distinguer ce Kronos dernier venu du Kronos grec qui est premier venu. Loin de prouver l'existence d'une antique source égyptienne (Harder, pp. 37–38), cette précision explicative me paraît l'indice que l'auteur quel qu'il soit (et ce peut fort bien être Diodore lui-même), avait en vue un auditoire grec.

[13] Bien plus graves sont les différences entre le texte de Stobée et celui des manuscrits du Corpus Hermeticum pour les parties communes: or nul ne songe à supposer ici un original égyptien diversement traduit, cf. l'introd. de Nock au Corp. Herm., I, pp. XLI ss. Pour un exemple particulièrement frappant dans les lettres hippocratiques, cf. G. Pasquali, Storia della tradizione . . . , Florence, 1934, pp. 404 ss.

[14] P. Roussel, l.c., pp. 143–144, n'excluait pas cette hypothèse.

2) Selon M. Harder, ce document, et par les idées et par la facture, se révèlerait égyptien. En ce qui touche les idées, observons qu'on peut, avec quelque érudition, soutenir ce qu'on veut. Depuis un demi-siècle, les sources des doctrines hermétiques ont été cherchées tour à tour en Egypte, dans l'Iran (voire dans l'Inde), en Judée, en Grèce. Mais il vaut la peine d'examiner quelques points.

Selon M. Harder (pp. 47 ss.), Isis, dans M, se présenterait surtout comme une Bienfaitrice de l'humanité; dans le même sens, le portrait du monarque d'Egypte dessiné par Hécatée en ses Aegyptiaca — portrait destiné à servir de modèle à Ptolémée — est essentiellement celui d'un Bienfaiteur: or ce trait serait purement égyptien, sans parallèle chez les Grecs. La thèse n'est pas nouvelle: elle a été soutenue en 1939 par H. Bolkestein, Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum, pp. 391 ss.[15] C'est oublier l'influence qu'a exercée la philosophie hellénistique sur les traités *περὶ βασιλείας*, aussi bien que sur les utopies ethnographiques d'Evhémère et d'Hécatée d'Abdère, comme l'avait marqué depuis longtemps Ed. Schwartz.[16] C'est oublier aussi que, dès le IV^e^ siècle, Isocrate, dans son discours-programme A Nicoclès,[17] prône la "philanthrôpia" comme le meilleur moyen, pour un monarque, de se concilier ses sujets.[18] C'est oublier enfin que l'idéal hellénistique du roi juste et évergète n'apparaît pas seulement en Egypte, mais dans tout l'Orient hellénisé, comme en font foi quantité d'inscriptions.[19]

Dans les paragraphes relatifs au mariage, M *30 ἐγὼ συγγραφὰς γαμικὰς εὗρον* ne serait pas grec. "Der Grieche kennt in älterer Zeit keine Ehe-Urkunde," dit M. Harder (p. 26), et il ajoute

[15] Voir mon c.r. dans REG, LIII, 1940, pp. 237–241.

[16] Influence de la philosophie sur Hécatée d'Abdère, Schwartz, Rh. Mus., XL, pp. 223 ss., en partic. 256 ss., Jacoby ap. P. W., VII, 2753 ss., 2758; sur Evhémère, Jacoby ap. P. W., VI, 957 ss.

[17] L'authenticité de ce discours n'a pas été contestée (cf. G. Mathieu, éd. Budé, II, p. 92), à la différence du Nicoclès.

[18] Cf. *Πρὸς Νικοκλέα* 15. Voir aussi 16: principes de la *χρηστὴ πολιτεία*, 17: lois justes et utiles, 18: pureté de la justice, 22: culte de la vérité (*τὴν ἀλήθειαν . . . φαίνου προτιμᾶν*. Selon Harder, p. 27, M *29 τὸ ἀληθὲς καλὸν ἐνομοθέτησα νομίζεσθαι* ne serait pas grec), 24: *ἀρχικὸς εἶναι βούλου μὴ χαλεπότητι μηδὲ τῷ σφόδρα κολάζειν*, et Evagoras 43: Justice et *φιλανθρωπία*, Philippe 114: *φιλανθρωπία*.

[19] Cf. W. Schubart, Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri, Arch. f. Pap., XII (1936), pp. 1 ss.

(p. 26, n. 1): "die *ἐγγύησις*, die Eheschliessungsform im klassischen attischen Recht, ist durchaus mündlich und unformell." N'est-ce pas exagéré? Comment expliquer dans ce cas que l' *ἐγγύησις*, faite devant témoins, ait valeur légale [20] et que le sort de la dot apportée au cours de l' *ἐγγύησις* soit soumis à des règles fixes, déterminées par la loi, pour le cas de divorce? [21] Quoi qu'il en soit de l'âge classique, à Mykonos en tout cas, dès l'époque macédonienne, le chiffre des dots apportées au cours de l' *ἐγγύησις* a été gravé sur une stèle pour décider en cas de litige (Syll.[3] 1215). Aussi bien M. Harder reconnaît-il (p. 26) que le contrat écrit est de règle à l'âge hellénistique.[22] S'il ajoute aussitôt: "Indessen niemals würde der Grieche die Stiftung der Ehe, also ein göttlichen Akt der Urzeit, unter der Form der Urkundlichkeit sehen," c'est pur arbitraire. Qu'en sait-il? Qu'en savons-nous? Dès là que des penseurs de l'âge hellénistique imaginent des dieux *εὑρεταί* de la civilisation (Evhémère), n'est-il pas naturel qu'ils leur attribuent la fondation du mariage, et sous la forme usuelle en leur temps? Déméter *Θεσμοφόρος* n'est pas, que l'on sache, une figure inventée par les hiérogrammates à l'âge hellénistique.

Non grec pareillement serait M *27 ἐγὼ στέργεσθαι γυναῖκας ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν ἠνάγκασα* (Harder, p. 26).[23] Renvoyons donc à Liddell-Scott, s.v. *στέργω* 2 ("love of husband and wife"), aux comédies de Ménandre où l'on voit les relations entre mari et femme se pénétrer de la plus délicate *στοργή*, à l'Ethique d'Aristote,[24] à l'école d'Epicure où les femmes tenaient tant de place et pouvaient même, comme Léontion qui épousa Métro-

[20] Cf. Thalheim, P.W., V 2567–2568. Pour la garantie civique du lien nuptial à l'âge classique, cf. Esch. Eum. 217–8 *εὐνὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γυναικὶ μόρσιμος | ὅρκου 'στι μείζων τῇ δίκῃ φρουρουμένη* avec la note de Thomson ad loc.

[21] Cf. Thalheim, P.W., s.v. Ehescheidung, V 2011–2013.

[22] Cf. Mitteis, Grundzüge, pp. 213–217.

[23] Aussi bien ne faut-il pas traduire: "Ich zwang die Männer, zu ihren Frauen gut zu sein" (Harder, p. 26), ce qu'on interprète comme une contrainte légale: il ne peut s'agir du *durus amor*, dit M. Harder, puisqu'on a *στέργειν*, "sondern es geht um Recht und Stellung der Frau gegenüber dem Mann." Le grec ne dit rien de tel: "J'ai fait de la tendre affection dont les femmes sont l'objet de la part de leurs maris une nécessité naturelle." Il s'agit bien en effet de *στοργή*, non d' *ἔρως*, mais cette *στοργή* est le fait de la nature.

[24] Cf. Arist., Eth. Nic., VIII 12, 1162 a 16 *ἀνδρὶ δὲ καὶ γυναικὶ φιλία δοκεῖ κατὰ φύσιν ὑπάρχειν . . .* a 25 *εἴη δ' ἂν καὶ δι' ἀρετήν, εἰ ἐπιεικεῖς εἶεν· ἔστι γὰρ ἑκατέρου ἀρετή, καὶ χαίροιεν ἂν τῷ τοιούτῳ.*

dore, être chargées de la présidence temporaire.[25] Ce rôle plus marqué des femmes et au foyer et même dans la vie publique est d'ailleurs, comme on sait, un trait de l'âge hellénistique, et pas seulement en Egypte.[26]

Prenons deux derniers exemples, celui de la tyrannie et celui de l'allélophagie. Isis dit M *25* *ἐγὼ τυράννων ἀρχὰς κατέλυσα*.[27] Sur quoi P. Roussel (p. 154): "A coup sûr, on imagine mal qu'un Egyptien, rappelant l'oeuvre civilisatrice de la déesse, rapporte à son action l'origine d'une ère de liberté, tandis que, chez un Grec, même à l'époque ptolémaïque, a pu subsister une haine théorique de la tyrannie." [28] M. Harder (p. 35) se moque de tout cela, et retrouve ces *τύραννοι* dans les "Gaufürsten" ou dynastes locaux qui auraient régné en divers points de l'Egypte avant la réunion de tout le pays entre les mains d'un seul maître. Isis serait *τύραννος πάσης χώρας* (M *3*) justement en tant qu'elle aurait anéanti le pouvoir des "Gaufürsten." Je reviendrai plus loin sur l'apparente contradiction de M *3* et *25* (si l'on entend *25* au sens grec). Ce qu'il faut noter ici, c'est que si, comme le veut M. Harder, M a été écrit par des prêtres égyptiens *pour les Grecs*, M *25*, entendu en ce sens "égyptien," n'a guère de portée. Un Grec devait immédiatement songer à d'autres tyrans, aux siens. A preuve A v. 96–97: *περισσότατον δὲ μονάρχων | δέσμον ἐγὼ κατέλυσα*. Et précisément il y a lieu de rappeler que la haine des tyrans s'est renouvelée à la fin du IV[e] siècle.[29]

[25] Cf. Epicure et ses dieux, pp. 40–41.

[26] Cf. W. W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilisation[2], pp. 89–91. Pour la protection de l'enfance et les devoirs des parents envers leurs enfants (M *20* *ἐγὼ τοῖς ἀστόργως γονεῦσι διακειμένοις τειμωρίαν ἐπέθηκα*), cf. Arist., Eth. Nic., VIII 14, 1163 b 18 ss.: un fils n'a pas le droit de répudier son père, mais un père peut répudier son fils, car il est, à l'endroit de ce fils, créancier: néanmoins, selon toute probabilité, nul père ne consentirait à répudier son fils, sauf dans le cas de vice extrême (*ἅμα δ' ἴσως οὐδείς ποτ' ἂν ἀποστῆναι δοκεῖ μὴ ὑπερβάλλοντος μοχθηρία*). Au surplus il ne faudrait pas exagérer la bonté des moeurs égyptiennes sur ce point: l'exposition des enfants existait en Egypte comme en Grèce, v. gr. P. Ox. IV 744 (I[er] siècle av. J.C.) = Lietzmann, Gr. Pap. (Kl. Texte 14), 5, ll. 8 ss. *ἐὰν πολλαπολλων τέκῃς, ἐὰν ἦν ἄρσενον, ἄφες, ἐὰν ἦν θήλεα, ἔκβαλε.*

[27] Peut-être, dans le P. Ox. 1380, 239, faut-il compléter avec Grenfell-Hunt *σὺ στρατείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας κυρία τοὺς ⟨τυράννους⟩ εὐκόπως διαφθείρεις πιστοῖς βουλεύμασι.* Contra van Groningen, De pap. Oxyrh. 1380, p. 58.

[28] Dans le même sens, Peek, p. 158.

[29] Cf. le décret d'Erésos contre des tyrans (dernier tiers du IV[e] s.), Inscr. Jur. Gr., II, p. 161 ss. (= OGI 8 I et II), deux décrets d'Erythrées ordonnant la restauration de la statue d'un tyrannicide (entre 333 et 324), Syll.[3] 284, le décret

Isis dit M *21 ἐγὼ μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ὀσίριδος τὰς ἀνθρωποφαγίας ἔπαυσα*, à quoi on peut joindre M *26 ἐγὼ φόνους ἔπαυσα*. M. Harder (pp. 28–32) soutient: (a) que la mention de l'allélophagie primitive n'apparaît pas avant l'Epinomis (975 a 5 *ἔστω δὴ πρῶτον μὲν ἡ τῆς ἀλληλοφαγίας τῶν ζῴων ἡμᾶς τῶν μέν, ὡς ὁ μῦθός ἐστιν, τὸ παράπαν ἀποστήσασα*, sc. *σοφία*), Théophraste (Porph., de abst., II 27: ici au vrai on a: Végétarianisme → Manque de céréales → Allélophagie → Sacrifices humains → Sacrifices d'animaux par substitution → Manducation des animaux), Moschion (Trag. Gr. Fr., p. 813, n°6 N²) dont on fait descendre la date de la première moitié du IV^e^ siècle à fin IV^e^/début III^e^ siècle; (b) que ces auteurs n'ont pas le trait caractéristique de M — suppression de l'anthropophagie par un dieu, — ce dernier trait n'apparaissant qu'avec Evhémère (63 F 22 Jac.: au temps de Kronos, la nourriture ordinaire des hommes est la chair humaine: Zeus, instituteur des lois et de la morale, interdit par décret, *edicto*, cet usage) et Hécatée d'Abdère qui attribue la suppression de l'allélophagie à Osiris (264 F 25 J. = Diod. I 14); [30] (c) qu'enfin Evhémère, Théophraste et Moschion lui-même dépendraient d'Hécatée d'Abdère, en sorte que la mention en M *21* se révèle comme purement égyptienne. Je cite (Harder, p. 30): "Es ergibt sich also, dass die Vorstellung vom Kannibalentum als einer Frühstufe des Menschengeschlechts den Griechen eigentlich fremd ist und nach einem ersten Anklingen in der Umgebung des alten Plato [31] plötzlich im Frühhellenismus in den Vordergrund tritt, und zwar so, dass manche Zeichen auf einen Anstoss von aussen weisen; es ist als müsste einmal eine wirksame Darstellung dieses Urkannibalismus ans Licht getreten sein, von der die genannten Zeugnisse nur einen Widerhall geben." Cette

---

de Priène après sa délivrance de la tyrannie de Hiéron (vers 297), I. Priène, 11, la loi d'Ilion contre les tyrans (III^e^ s.), Inscr. Jur. Gr., II, pp. 25 ss.

[30] *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ παῦσαι* (sc. *τὸν Ὄσιριν*) *τῆς ἀλληλοφαγίας τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος, εὑρούσης μὲν Ἴσιδος τόν τε τοῦ πυροῦ καὶ τῆς κριθῆς καρπόν . . . , τοῦ δὲ Ὀσίριδος ἐπινοησαμένου καὶ τὴν τούτων κατεργασίαν τῶν καρπῶν ἡδέως μεταθέσθαι πάντας τὴν τροφὴν διὰ . . . τὸ φαίνεσθαι συμφέρον ὑπάρχειν ἀπέχεσθαι τῆς κατ' ἀλλήλων ὠμότητος.*

[31] La phrase de l'Epinomis, dont M. Harder se débarrasse aisément en la qualifiant de "dunkle Stelle" (p. 29), "ein schlimm verklausulierter Satz" (p. 29, fin note 2 de la p. 28).

"wirksame Darstellung" serait celle d'Hécatée d'Abdère. Tout ceci est pur roman.[32]

Pour simplifier la discussion et donner la part belle à M. Harder, nous laisserons ici le poète Moschion dont la date est controversée. Mais il reste l'Epinomis qui, même si on l'enlève à Platon, est sûrement de peu postérieure à sa mort, donc des environs de 348. Or l'Epinomis fait état d'un *μῦθος* traditionnel (*ὡς ὁ μῦθός ἐστιν*). De fait il existe deux traditions, qui d'ailleurs se corroborent. L'une est relative aux peuples barbares des temps historiques qui, aux confins des régions civilisées, mènent encore la vie des bêtes, à l'état nomade, sans lois, sans agriculture, et se nourrissent de chair humaine: [33] tels les Androphages d'Hérodote (au nord des Scythes: Hérod. IV 106), les peuplades du Pont dont parle Aristote (Eth. Nic. VII 4, 1148 b 22 *λέγω δὲ τὰς θηριώδεις (φύσεις), οἷον . . . ἢ οἵοις χαίρειν φασὶν ἐνίους τῶν ἀπηγριωμένων περὶ τὸν Πόντον, τοὺς μὲν ὠμοῖς τοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπων κρέασιν*, Pol. VIII 4, 1338 b 19 *πολλὰ δ' ἐστὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἃ πρὸς τὸ κτείνειν καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρωποφαγίαν εὐχερῶς ἔχει, καθάπερ τῶν περὶ τὸν Πόντον Ἀχαιοί τε καὶ Ἡνίοχοι καὶ τῶν ἠπειρωτικῶν ἕτερα*), les peuplades anonymes que mentionne Platon et dont il dit que, chez elles, l'anthropophagie est une *survivance* de l'état primitif de l'humanité (Lois VI 782 c 1 *τὸ δὲ μὴν θύειν ἀνθρώπους ἀλλήλους ἔτι καὶ νῦν παραμένον ὁρῶμεν πολλοῖς*). Dans un oracle de la Déméter de Phigalie cité par Pausanias (VIII 42, 6), la déesse menace les Arcadiens de les faire retourner à leur état primitif de nomades anthropophages dont elle les avait tirés. On notera dans ces textes l'alliance entre l'état de vie sauvage (*τῶν ἀπηγριωμένων* Aristote, *ἀγριοδαῖται* Pausanias) ou bestiale (*τὰς θηριώδεις*, sc. *φύσεις* Arist.) et l'allélophagie. Parlant des animaux

[32] Au surplus, le sujet n'est pas neuf. Cf. J. Haussleiter, Der Vegetarismus in der Antike (RG VV XXIV, 1935), ch. 8: Die Urgeschichte der Nahrung im Lichte des Vegetarismus, pp. 54 ss., et, plus anciennement, pour le passage de l'état sauvage à l'état civilisé, W. Graf Uxkull-Gyllenband, Griech. Kulturentstehungslehren (Beil. zu Arch. f. Gesch. d. Phil., XXXVI, 1924), E. Norden, Beiträge zur Gesch. d. gr. Philosophie, Jahrb. f. kl. Phil., 19, Suppl. Bd., 1893, pp. 414 ss. et déjà Preller, Philol., VII (1852), pp. 1–60. Voir aussi une note intéressante dans Zielinski, Die Märchenkomödie in Athen (= Iresione, I, pp. 71/2) qui analyse les passages de l'Ancienne Comédie se rapportant à l'âge d'or, "au temps où les bêtes parlaient" (cf. ib., pp. 12, 31–45). L'étude de Zielinski est de 1885.

[33] Déjà peut-être Polyphème, qui n'est pas *σιτοφάγος* (Od. IX 191), mais *ἀνδροφάγος* (X 200).

à l'âge d'or, Platon dit de même (Polit. 271 d 5): les animaux vivaient alors en paix, *ὥστε οὔτ' ἄγριον ἦν οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀλλήλων ἐδωδαί*. Le cannibalisme est un signe d'*ἀγριότης*, Ephore fr. 76 *τοὺς μὲν γὰρ εἶναι χαλεπούς, ὥστε καὶ ἀνθρωποφαγεῖν*, Aristote H. An. II 1, 501 b 1 *ἄγριον καὶ ἀνθρωποφάγον*.

L'autre tradition est relative à l'état sauvage, littéralement bestial (*θηριώδης βίος*), dans lequel a vécu d'abord l'humanité avant les progrès de la civilisation: [34] Eurip. Suppl. 201 ss. (c. 422) *αἰνῶ δ' ὃς ἡμῖν βίοτον ἐκ πεφυρμένου | καὶ θηριώδους θεῶν διεσταθμήσατο* en nous donnant *τροφὴν καρποῦ*, Critias, Sisyphos (= Vorsokr. 88 B 25), v. 1 s. *ἦν χρόνος, ὅτ' ἦν ἄτακτος ἀνθρώπων βίος | καὶ θηριώδης ἰσχύος θ' ὑπηρέτης*, Hippocr. *π. ἀρχ. ἰητρ.* 3, p. 38.3 Heib. (c. 420–400) *ὡς γὰρ ἔπασχον πολλά τε καὶ δεινὰ ὑπὸ ἰσχυρῆς τε καὶ θηριώδεος διαίτης κτλ.*, Isocr. Pan. 28 *Δήμητρος γὰρ ἀφικομένης εἰς τὴν χώραν . . . καὶ δούσης . . . τούς τε καρπούς, οἳ τοῦ μὴ θηριωδῶς ζῆν ἡμᾶς αἴτιοι γεγόνασιν, καὶ τὴν τελετὴν κτλ.* (cf. Busir. 25 *θηριωδῶς διακεῖσθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους*).[35] D'autre part c'est un fait d'expérience que les *θηρία* s'entre-dévorent, Hés. Trav. 276 ss., Plat. Polit. 271 d 5, Protag. 321 a 3 (mais non pas toujours entre bêtes de même espèce, Arist. H. An., IX 2, 391 a 17, 393 b 27). A coup sûr on ne peut affirmer que, dans toutes ces mentions du *θηριώδης βίος*, il s'agisse, chaque fois, de l'allélophagie.[35a] Du moins avons-nous vu que l'alliance entre vie sauvage ou bestiale et cannibalisme paraît sous la plume de Platon, d'Aristote, d'Ephore,[36] et c'est en tout cas dans

[34] A vrai dire les Grecs avaient sur ce point deux traditions. Dans l'une, les hommes ont commencé par le *θηριώδης βίος* qui semble impliquer l'anthropophagie. Dans l'autre (l'âge d'or: voir Zielinski, cité supra n. 32), les hommes ont commencé par le végétarianisme, la terre leur offrant d'elle-même tous ses fruits: Hés. Trav., 109–201, Empéd. fr. 128, Plat. Polit. 271 d–e, Lois 782 c 2 ss. où les deux états primitifs, celui de l'allélophagie et celui de l' *Ὀρφικὸς βίος*, sont opposés. Théophraste (Porph. de abst. II 27) mêle les deux traditions, son dessein étant de montrer que les hommes ont commencé par le végétarianisme et que l'usage actuel (manducation des animaux) est la survivance d'une perversion abominable (anthropophagie) dont les hommes se sont rendus coupables quand les fruits de la terre ont manqué.

[35] Je laisse à dessein Protagoras, *περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως* (Plat Prot. 320 c 8 ss., Polit. 274 b–e et Vorsokr. II, p. 269) parce qu'on ne peut prouver en effet que Protagoras y ait mentionné l'allélophagie d'une manière explicite, cf. Harder, p. 28, n. 1.

[35a] C'est le cas, par exemple, d'Hippocrate, *π.d.l.*

[36] Plus tard encore: cf. Athénion (III[e] s. av. J.C.: Kaibel, P.W., II 2041) ap. Com. Att. Fr., III 369 K., v. 4–6 *τοῦ θηριώδους καὶ παρασπόνδου βίου | ἡμᾶς γὰρ*

ce sens que l'auteur de l'Epinomis a interprété le μῦθος de la vie bestiale. Dès lors, sans même parler de Moschion, il paraît établi que vers le milieu du IV^e siècle, bien avant Hécatée d'Abdère et sans influence aucune de l'Egypte, les Grecs posédaient une tradition (ὡς ὁ μῦθός ἐστιν) sur l'anthropophagie primitive.

Maintenant le texte de l'Epinomis n'est pas une allusion "obscure" (dunkle Stelle). La phrase, un peu gauche, a été parfaitement élucidée par A. E. Taylor (Plato and the authorship of the Epinomis, Proc. Brit. Ac., XV, 1929, pp. 38–40). Le sens est: "Soit donc en premier lieu le savoir qui nous a fait renoncer à l'usage qu'avaient les êtres vivants de se manger entre eux, qui d'une part, pour certains d'entre eux (les autres hommes), nous y a fait renoncer complètement comme le dit la légende, tandis que, pour les autres (les animaux), il nous a portés à les consommer d'une manière civilisée (sc. en en cuisant la chair, cf. Arist. Eth. Nic. VII 4, 1148 b 23 τοὺς μὲν ὠμοῖς τοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπων κρέασιν, où c'est bien à tort qu'on a voulu exclure τοὺς δὲ)." Cette phrase vient en tête d'une liste des arts nécessaires à la vie (974 d 8–975 c 8): l'art de faire le pain (975 b 1–5), c'est à dire d'utiliser les céréales, cet art coïncidant avec la suppression de l'anthropophagie primitive (975 a 5–7) et l'introduction de la culture du blé (975 b 5–7); l'art de construire des maisons, arts mobiliers (975 b 7–c 4); chasse (975 c 4–6); mantique (975 c 6–8). Suivent les arts de jeu (975 c 9–d 9) et les arts de secours (art militaire, médecine, navigation, barreau: 975 e 1–976 b 4). Ces arts, dans l'Epinomis, ont été successivement acquis par l'homme sans qu'il soit fait allusion à l'enseignement d'un dieu. De même dans les Lois III 676 a–700 a (en particulier 677 e–679 e), ainsi que chez Aristote, Protreptique (fr. 53 R² = Jambl.,

---

ἀπολύσασα (sc. ἡ μαγειρικὴ τέχνη), καὶ τῆς δυσχεροῦς | ἀλληλοφαγίας, Plut. Is. Os. 13 βασιλεύοντα δ' Ὄσιριν Αἰγυπτίους μὲν εὐθὺς ἀπόρου βίου καὶ θηριώδους ἀπαλλάξαι καρπούς τε δείξαντα καὶ νόμους θέμενον αὐτοῖς κτλ. (passage évidemment inspiré d'Hécatée qui attribue à Osiris la suppression de l'allélophagie). Je ne fais pas état, la date n'en étant pas certaine, de deux vers du θεολόγος Ὀρφεύς (Sext. Emp. Adv. Math. II 31, t. II, p. 216.5 M. = Orph. Fr., n°292 K.) ἦν χρόνος, ἡνίκα φῶτες ἀπ' ἀλλήλων βίον εἶχον | σαρκοδακῆ, κρείσσων δὲ τὸν ἤττονα φῶτα δάϊζεν. Sur le v. 1032 des Grenouilles Ὀρφεὺς μὲν γὰρ τελετάς θ' ἡμῖν κατέδειξε φόνων τ' ἀπέχεσθαι et ceux d'Horace, Ars. poet. 391–392 *silvestris homines sacer interpresque deorum | caedibus et uictu foedo deterruit Orpheus*, cf. Linforth, The Arts of Orpheus (Berkeley, 1941), pp. 68 ss.: le sens "he put an end to cannibalism" n'est pas exclu.

Comm. Pyth., III) et *περὶ φιλοσοφίας* (ap. Aristoclès de Messine),[37] et déjà dans l'Antigone (c. 441) de Sophocle (332 ss. *πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κοὐδὲν ἀνθρώτου δεινότερον πέλει*). Mais cette version rationaliste n'est pas la seule ni même peut-être la plus ancienne. Selon une autre version, qui remonte au moins au Prométhée (entre 467 et 458) d'Eschyle, ce sont des dieux qui apportent aux hommes les arts nécessaires à la vie: pour Eschyle (Prom. 441–506) et Protagoras (Plat. Prot. 321 c 4 ss.), c'est Prométhée (mais *αἰδώς* et *δίκη*, fondements de l'art politique, sont dons de Zeus par l'intermédiaire d'Hermès, Prot. 322 b–c); pour Euripide (Suppl. 201 ss.), c'est l'un des dieux; pour Isocrate, c'est Déméter. Résumant cette double tradition, Moschion (l.c.) attribuera le passage de la vie *θηριώδης* à la vie civilisée soit à Prométhée, soit au Temps qui donne aux hommes le sentiment de l'*ἀνάγκη* (la *χρεία* de Protagoras), soit à la Nature.

On voit donc que le morceau de l'Epinomis s'insère dans une longue tradition. Ce qu'il a de neuf — si vraiment c'est neuf — c'est l'interprétation du *μῦθος* courant (et bien connu: *ὡς ὁ μῦθός ἐστιν*) dans le sens de l'allélophagie, dont la suppression coïncide avec l'art de cultiver et d'utiliser les céréales. Quand Evhémère et Hécatée d'Abdère font de Zeus, ou d'Osiris et Isis, les initiateurs de la civilisation, ils suivent à leur tour l'antique légende des dieux *εὑρεταί*. De même, je le montrerai bientôt, les arétalogies d'Isis. Hécatée n'a inventé ni le schème général, qui remonte au moins à Eschyle, ni même la précision relative à l'allélophagie, qui remonte au moins au cercle de Platon (vers 350), pour ne rien dire de Moschion. Il n'y a donc rien de "plötzlich," aucun "Anstoss von aussen" dans la mention de l'allélophagie. Celle-ci n'est pas "den Griechen eigentlich fremd," elle n'apparaît pas seulement à la fin du IV^e^ siècle, elle ne vient pas de l'Egypte.

Maintenant est-il sûr que M ne présente aucun ordre, ce manque d'ordre étant la preuve de l'origine égyptienne du document? [38]

A la vérité le désordre apparent est ce qui frappe d'abord. On constate de nombreux doublets. Ainsi la navigation: *49–50* =

[37] Cf. Bywater, J. of Phil., VII, 1876, pp. 64–75.
[38] Cf. supra, p. 1, n. 5.

15; [39] le mariage: *27*, *30* = *17*; le thème de l'Isis législatrice énoncé en *4* (*ἐγὼ νόμους ἀνθρώποις ἐθέμην κτλ*), repris en *52* (*ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θεσμοφόρος καλουμένη*); la force du droit proclamée trois fois: *16* (*ἐγὼ τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχυρὸν ἐποίησα*), *28* (*ἐγὼ τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχυρότερον χρυσίου . . . ἐδποίησα*), *38* (*παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχύει*), etc. Cependant une lecture attentive permet de reconnaître un certain cadre général, qui impose à l'ouvrage un certain ordre, tandis que, dans les diverses parties de cet ensemble, les propositions se suivent parfois (non pas toujours) d'une façon incoordonnée. Or il va de soi que c'est le cadre qui importe: c'est lui qui permet de déterminer le genre littéraire de l'ouvrage. Et il est naturel aussi que, dans les différentes sections de ce cadre, la forme même adopté (*ἐγώ εἰμι κτλ*) donne lieu soit à des interversions par le fait d'erreurs de copiste, soit à un nombre indéfini d'additions à mesure qu'on découvre en Isis l'institutrice d'un nombre toujours plus grand d'*εὑρήματα*. Quel est donc le cadre?

On distingue, outre la conclusion (*57*), trois thèmes principaux qui forment l'ordonnance suivante: A B^1 C B^2.

A. *Nature de la divinité* (*3–11*), cette première partie se subdivisant elle-même en trois sections. La déesse nouvelle, qui se présente pour la première fois au public grec, fait d'abord connaître son nom, évidemment: *Εἶσις ἐγώ εἰμι*.[40] Elle indique ensuite:

[39] M *50 ἐγὼ τὰ πλωτὰ ἄπλωτα ποιῶ, ὅταν ἐμοὶ δόξῃ* n'est pas un miracle par lequel Isis changerait la mer en terre (Harder, p. 46, n. 3), mais "je rends la mer non navigable, quand il me plaît," cf. la formule d'imprécation *μὴ θάλασσαν πλωτὴν εἶναι*, Syll.[3] 1238.7, 1239.15. Aussi bien les versets *49* et *50* vont ensemble.

[40] P. Roussel, l.c., p. 147, n. 1, compare déjà *h. hom. à Déméter* 268 ss. *εἰμὶ δὲ Δημήτηρ τιμάοχος κτλ*, mais il y a des parallèles plus significatifs encore dans les prologues d'Euripide et de ses imitateurs. A côté de la formule *ἥκω* (Hec. 1 ss. Ion 1 ss., Troad. 1 ss., Bacch. 1 ss.), on trouve en effet dans ces prologues la formule *ἐγώ εἰμι*, cf. Philem., fr. 91 Kock: *δν οὐδὲ εἷς λέληθεν . . . , οὗτός εἰμ' ἐγὼ 'Αήρ, κτλ*, Menand., fr. 545 K.: *Ἔλεγχός εἰμ' ἐγώ, κτλ*, Frg. Adesp. 154 K., III p. 439: *ἀμορφότατος τὴν ὄψιν εἰμὶ γὰρ Φόβος*, Philyll., I p. 784 K.: *βούλεσθε δῆτ' ἐγὼ φράσω, τίς εἰμ' ἐγώ; ἡ τῶν προτενθῶν Δορπία καλουμένη*, Plaut. Aulul. 2 *ego Lar sum familiaris* sq., Trinumm. 6 *nunc igitur primum quae ego sim . . . dicam* sq. Avec O. Weinreich (De dis ignotis, ARW, XVIII, 1915, p. 42), on peut rapprocher de ces prologues les déclarations des annonciateurs de "Bonne Nouvelle" comme Simon le Magicien (Acta Apost. Apocr., I, p. 132.10 Lipsius): *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς* (cf. Ev. Joh. 8, 42) ou les prédicateurs ambulants dont parle Celse ap. Orig. VII 9 (p. 55.12 Glöckner): *ἐγὼ ὁ θεός εἰμι ἢ πνεῦμα θεῖον . . . ἐγὼ δὲ σῶσαι θέλω* (sur ces textes, cf. Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 222 s., Norden, Agn. Theos, pp. 188 ss.: il est amusant de com-

I Ses *caractéristiques essentielles*: Isis est
  (a) maîtresse de toute la terre (*3*),[41]
  (b) inventrice (avec Hermès) de l'écriture hiéroglyphique et démotique (*3*),
  (c) institutrice des lois et des ἀρχαῖα νόμιμα intangibles (*4*).

II Sa *généalogie*: Isis est
  (a) fille de Kronos (*5*),
  (b) femme et soeur d'Osiris avec qui elle donne les céréales (*6–7*),[42]
  (c) mère d'Hôros (*8*).

III Son *culte*: Isis est
  (a) Isis-Sôthis fêtée au nouvel an (*9*) [43]
  (b) adorée spécialement par les femmes (*10*)
  (c) Dame de Boubastis (*11*).[44]

B–C. *Omnipotence et inventions de la divinité* (*12–56*). Ces deux thèmes de la δύναμις et des εὑρήματα s'emboîtent l'un dans l'autre en sorte que la section sur les εὑρήματα (C) paraît comme encadrée entre deux sections sur l'omnipotence (B^1, B^2). Voyons d'abord ce qui a trait à l'omnipotence (*12–14* et *39–56*).[45]

I Isis *maîtresse du ciel*: elle
  sépare ciel et terre (B^1 *12*),
  fixe la course des astres (B^1 *13*), en particulier du

---

parer la fable du chien et de la brebis dans Xen. Mem. II 7, 14 τὸν κύνα οὖν ἀκούσαντα εἰπεῖν, Ναὶ μὰ Δία' ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτὰς σώζων). Ces parallèles donnent le ton de notre morceau. Isis n'est pas proprement salvatrice, mais elle annonce elle aussi une "Bonne Nouvelle": elle a fondé la civilisation.

[41] ἡ τύραννος πάσης χώρας. Ce peut être ou toute la terre d'Egypte (Harder, p. 35, n. 6) ou "tout pays," toute la terre (ainsi ont compris Andros, v.7–9, Cyrène [Peek, p. 129], v.4–8). Même si, à l'origine, π. χ. n'a visé que l'Egypte, dans notre inscription le sens "toute la terre" me semble plus probable. D'emblée Isis revendique ses droits au culte: elle est reine de tout pays. τύραννος n'est pas ici péjoratif (βασίλισσα Diod.) et ne fait pas contradiction avec M *25*.

[42] Cf. Diod. I 14, cité supra, n. 30.

[43] Sur ce point, cf. Roeder, s.v. Sothis ap. Roscher, Lex. Myth.

[44] On notera aussitôt la composition trinaire: on la retrouve en d'autres sections, comme l'a observé déjà Harder, p. 46, n. 4.

[45] Dans cette section B^2 ont été inclus deux paragraphes (*51* enceinte des villes, *52* Isis Thesmophoros) qui reviennent apparemment à la section C, mais cf. plus loin le parallèle en A qui offre un ordre meilleur, résultant sans doute d'une copie plus correcte.

soleil et de la lune (B^1 *14*); ce thème reparaît en B^2: Isis
loge dans les rayons solaires (B^2 *44*),
est parèdre du soleil en sa course (B^2 *45*).

II Isis *maîtresse des éléments* (seulement en B^2):
fleuves et vents (*39*), mer (*39*, *43*), foudre (*42*), pluies (*53*); Isis a fait surgir les îles ou continents (*52*).

III *Rien ne se fait sans moi, tout m'obéit* (seulement en B^2):
Sans moi nul n'est glorifié (*40*); maîtresse de la guerre (*41*).
Tous mes décrets s'accomplissent (*46*), tout me cède (*47*), je délie tous les liens (magiques? *48*).
Je vaincs le destin (*55*), le destin m'obéit (*56*).

Comme je l'ai dit, les deux sections B^1 et B^2 encadrent la section C sur les εὑρήματα. Celle-ci (*15–38*), après un premier verset (*15*) sur la navigation,[46] invention particulièrement chère aux Grecs, commence et finit par deux versets identiques de portée générale sur l'εὕρημα capital du *droit* (*16* ἐγὼ τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχυρὸν ἐποίησα = *38* παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχύει),[47] tandis que les versets intermédiaires précisent les différentes parties du δίκαιον dont Isis est le principe. C'est ici, à vrai dire, que l'ordre est le moins rigoureux. Si le premier morceau sur le mariage et la famille (*17* union de l'homme et de la femme, *18* temps de la parturition, *19* amour filial, *20* protection de l'enfance), le morceau sur la religion (*21–22* suppression de l'anthropophagie et initiations,[48] *23* culte des ἀγάλματα, *24* temples) et les six derniers versets (*32* distinction du bien et du mal, *33* respect du serment,[49] *34–35* châtiment des criminels, *36* respect des suppliants, *37*

[46] L'expression θαλάσσια ἔργα a une saveur homérique, cf. *Il.* II 614 οὔ σφι θ. ἔργα μεμήλει, Od. V 67 κορῶναι εἰνάλιαι, τῇσίν τε θ. ἔργα μέμηλεν.

[47] Peut-être la reprise de ce thème (*28* ἐγὼ τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχυρότερον . . . ἐποίησα) quasi au milieu de la section C (*16–38*) est-elle intentionnelle, marquant ainsi une sorte de pause. Mais c'est peut-être chercher là trop de raffinement.

[48] Les deux vont ensemble dans la tradition grecque: Déméter apporte le blé (d'où en conséquence, suppression de l'anthropophagie) *et* enseigne les mystères. Il semble bien que le poète d'Andros ait suivi (d'après son modèle) le même ordre, cf. Peek, pp. 51 ss.

[49] Sur la puissance du dieu Ὅρκος = Ἅιδης, cf. outre Roscher, I, 2742 (insuffisant), voir surtout Zielinski, Exkurse zu den Trachinierinnen, Philol. LV, 1896 = Iresione, I, p. 291, n. 1 (ad. Trach. 255).

droit de légitime défense) [50] forment des touts cohérents, le reste (*25–31*) présente une suite assez lâche: suppression de la tyrannie (*25*) et des meurtres (*26*); amour de l'époux pour l'épouse (*27*); droit plus fort qu'or et argent (*28*);[51] culte de la vérité (*29*); invention du mariage par contrat (*30*); répartition des langues entre Grecs et Barbares (*31*).[52] Encore est-il que ces versets incoordonnés *25–31* se rapportent à une même idée commune: Isis est l'inventrice ou l'institutrice de la civilisation sous le triple aspect du droit (*25, 26, 28, 30*), de la morale (*27, 29*) et des rapports sociaux (langage: *31*).

Arrêtons-nous un instant sur ces anomalies de détail des sections C et B^2 (*51–52* hors de place: voir supra n. 45). Elles ne forcent pas, selon moi, de recourir à un prétendu "désordre égyptien," mais peuvent s'expliquer par l'hypothèse, plus simple

[50] Ou droit d'asile? (sic Harder, p. 47, n. 2): *ἐγὼ τοὺς δικαίως ἀμυνομένους τειμῶ*. Mais cf. *34 ἐγὼ τὸν ἀδίκως ἐπιβουλεύοντα ἄλλῳ ὑποχείριον τῷ ἐπιβουλευομένῳ παρέδωκα*. Ici encore M. Harder (p. 27) voit quelque chose d'oriental, de non grec: "auch die Griechen sahen den Rechtsstreit als Kampf, aber der Sieg in diesem Kampf wird (in der idealen Vorstellung) doch nicht in dieser (an Magie erinnernden) Weise ausgekostet." Quoi de magique en cet *ὑποχείριον*? N'est-ce pas un principe du droit privé grec (*δίκη* au sens propre, distingué de *γραφή*) que la cité n'intervient que si la personne lésée elle-même, ou son représentant légal, intente le procès, fait la citation, prend la parole à l'audience (cf. Glotz, La cité grecque, p. 272)? Et l'*habeas corpus* n'est-il pas de mise en cas de flagrant délit? Cf. Thalheim, P.W., s.v. *δίκη* (V 577 ss.), *ἀπαγωγή* (I 2660).

[51] L'expression a une saveur orientale, cf. dans l'A.T. Job 28.15 ss., Psalm. 118,72 *ἀγαθόν μοι ὁ νόμος . . . σου ὑπὲρ χιλιάδας χρυσίου καὶ ἀργυρίου*, Prov. 3, 14 *κρεῖττον γὰρ αὐτὴν* (sc. *τὴν σοφίαν*) *ἐμπορεύεσθαι ἢ χρυσίου καὶ ἀργυρίου θησαυρούς*, Sap. Sal. 7, 10, mais les équivalents purement grecs ne manquent pas, Esch. Choeph. 372 *ταῦτα μέν, ὦ παῖ, κρείσσονα χρυσοῦ . . . φωνεῖς* et les parallèles cités par Headlam-Thomson, The Oresteia (Cambridge, 1938), II, p. 192 (en particulier Aristote, h. à Herméias [= fr. 675 R^2], v.7 *καρπόν τ' ἰσοθάνατον χρυσοῦ τε κρείσσω*). Ajouter le début de la 1e Olympique de Pindare, que tout petit Grec devait savior par coeur, *ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ ἅτε διαπρέπει κτλ.* et les vers cités dans la 1e Lettre du Ps. Platon, 310 a 4 *οὐ χρυσὸς ἀγλαὸς . . . , οὐδ' ἀδάμας οὐδ' ἀργύρου κλῖναι πρὸς ἀνθρώπων δοκιραζόμεν' ἀστράπτει πρὸς ὄψεις . . . ὡς ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ὁμοφράδμων νόησις*.

[52] *ἐγὼ διαλέκτους Ἕλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις διεταξάμην* (J: *ἔταξα* K). M. Harder (p. 21, n. 1 et p. 34) fait grand état de cette variante *διεταξάμην*: il s'agirait d'une tradition égyptienne selon laquelle les langues ont été divisées entre les hommes (non données aux hommes) par la divinité (Harder, après Roussel, p. 147, cite un hymne d'Aménophis IV en l'honneur du dieu Aton). C'est possible, mais *διεταξάμην* et *ἔταξα* reviennent au même sens "j'ai disposé, j'ai arrangé" (la variante n'a guère plus de portée qu'en M *14 συνεταξάμην* K S: *συνέταξα* J, M *18 δεκαμηνιαῖον* K S: *δεκάμηνον* J, M *27 μυήσεις ἐπέδειξα* K S: *μυήσεις ἀνέδειξα* J), et *βαρβάροις* peut difficilement avoir été conçu par un non Grec (Roussel, p. 147).

et plus normale, d'interversions dans les diverses copies du texte qui ont circulé à travers le monde grec. Or il faut noter à ce sujet que le modèle en prose de l'hymne d'Andros (A^p) a dû offrir, dans le détail, des variantes à l'égard de K. Ainsi, dans la section que j'ai nommée B^2, le verset sur la guerre (*41* ἐγώ εἰμι πολέμου κυρία) et les versets hors de place sur Isis fondatrice des enceintes de villes (*51* ἐγὼ περιβόλους πόλεων ἔκτισα) et Thesmophore (*52*) font un même ensemble, ce qui vaut mieux et suppose un texte plus correct: A, v.158–160 Ἶσις ἐγὼ πολέμω κρυερὸν νέφος ἔρκεσι μόχθων | ἀμφέβαλον κλῄζοισι πολυκτέανον βασιλείαν | θεσμοφόρος.[53] La phrase est extraordinairement compliquée et les commentateurs divergent (cf. Peek, pp. 69–70), mais le sens paraît être: "contre le nuage glacé de la guerre avec ses misères, moi, Isis thesmophore, j'ai entouré d'une ceinture de remparts le royaume opulent," βασιλεία remplaçant ici le πόλεις de K. Isis toute puissante est ainsi maîtresse de la guerre, non pas en ce qu'elle la déchaîne — elle est déesse pacifique et civilisatrice, la guerre ne peut que lui faire horreur, — mais en ce qu'elle la rejette au dehors des cités ou royaumes qu'elle protège: réunis, comme ils le sont dans A, ces trois versets de K (*41* + *51*, *52*) font un tout bien ordonné qui convient à la section B^2 sur l'omnipotence de la déesse. De même, en A, les versets *39* (Isis maîtresse des fleuves) et *43* (Isis maîtresse des flots) sont liés (A, v.127–133: ce qui reste de ces vers mutilés permet d'en reconnaître le sens général, cf. Peek, pp. 62–63) et suivis de ce qui correspond au verset *40* (οὐθεὶς δοξάζεται ἄνευ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης). A, v. 167–169, a la culture du vin, qui manque en K, puis le correspondant de K *42* (Isis maîtresse de la foudre), cependant qu'Isis maîtresse des pluies (K *54*) a été transposé en A beaucoup plus haut (v. 56–57), après la culture du blé et la suppression de l'anthropophagie (v. 44 ss. ἔμμι δ'ἀρούρας πυρνοτόκω μεδέοισα, δαϊξάνδρων δ'ἀπὸ χειρῶν κτλ). On peut imaginer, sans doute, que tous ces changements sont dus au versificateur lui-même qui aura réorganisé sa matière, mais il est aussi naturel de supposer des variantes dans la disposition d'un commun texte. Redisons-le, de telles interversions sont presque inévitables dans la copie d'un texte commençant chaque fois par la

[53] *Sic iure* Peek, p. 69: θεσμοφόρον A.

même formule *ἐγώ εἰμι*. Et il en va pareillement des omissions: ainsi Ios et Andros n'ont pas Isis mère d'Hôros (K *8*), Ios n'a pas l'invention de la culture du blé (K *7*) ni la suppression des meurtres (K *26*). Dans l'invention de l'écriture (K *3*), Ios omet les hiéroglyphes (*τά τε ἱερά*). En K *18*, Ios omet *εἰς φῶς*.

Résumons le problème. Sauf les anomalies de détail, qui peuvent s'expliquer par des interversions de paragraphes, dans un petit groupe (*25–31*) de la section centrale (C) et un autre (*51–52*) de la section B^2, le texte présente une disposition ordonnée, dont je rappelle les éléments: Nature d'Isis (A), Omnipotence d'Isis (B^1, B^2), *εὑρήματα* d'Isis (C), prière finale (*χαῖρε κτλ*, *57*). Or cette division rappelle aussitôt celle des hymnes grecs de l'âge classique ou hellénistique, dont l'ordonnance est la suivante: [54] (I) Nature, (II) *δύναμις*, (III) *ἔργα* ou *εὑρήματα* de la divinité, (IV) prière finale. A la *φύσις* de la divinité on ajoute généralement les lieux de culte, ou du moins le principal lieu de culte, où on l'honore (ici K *11*: Isis Dame de Boubastis) et sa généalogie (ici K *5–7*). Pour les lieux de culte, cf. par exemple Hérondas IV (à Asklépios), v. 1–2, péan d'Isyllos (Powell, p. 133: vers 300), v.2, péan delphique (ib., p. 141: 128/127), v.3–7, péan d'Aristonoos (ib., p. 162: vers 322), v.1–4, hymne d'Aristonoos à Hestia (ib., p. 164), v. 1–5. Pour le *γένος*, cf. Hérond. IV, v. 3–9, Isyllos, v. 5 ss., péan à Asklépios d'Erythrées (Powell, p. 136: vers 360), v.4–18, péan à Asklépios de Dium (ib., p. 137: ép. rom.), v. 3–16, péan de Makédonios (ib., p. 138: ép. rom.) v. 11–23, péan delphique de Liménios (ib., p. 149: 128/127), v.5 ss., péan d'Aristonoos, v. 5–16, péan de Philodamos à Dionysos (ib., p. 165: vers 325/4), v. 6 ss.

Quant au *χαῖρε* final, il est naturellement de règle: car l'hymne, en son principe, est une prière de louange, et il peut se réduire

[54] Norden, Agnostos Theos pp. 168 ss. Voir au surplus, outre l'article Hymnos de Wünsch (P.W., IX 140 ss.), K. Keyssner, Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griech. Hymnus (Würzb. Stud., II, 1932), J. Amann, Die Zeusrede des Ailios Aristides (Tüb. Beitr., XII 1932), E. Neustadt, Hermes, LXVI, 1931, pp. 387 ss. (à propos de l'hymne de Cléanthe). Il est intéressant de noter que les rhéteurs de l'époque impériale, Quintilien, Alexandre, Ménandre (et le Ps. Ménandre), s'accordent encore pour distinguer dans l'hymne trois *τόποι* principaux: 1) la nature (*φύσις*) et le *γένος* du dieu, 2) sa *δύναμις*, 3) ses *ἔργα* ou *εὑρήματα*, cf. Alex., p. 4.26 ss. Spengel (*φύσις* et *γένος*), p. 5.27 (*δύναμις*, *ἔργα*), p. 6.2 (*εὑρήματα*).

au schème tout simple "invocation initiale, prière," comme on le voit dans le II^e hymne homérique à Déméter (trois vers: *Δήμητρ' . . . ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν*, v.1; *χαῖρε, θεά*, v.3) et le II^e hymne homérique à Apollon (5 vers: invocation, v.1–4; *χαῖρε, ἄναξ*, v.5). Malgré M. Harder (p. 37 et n. 5), qui compare le *χαῖρε, Αἴγυπτε ἡ θρέψασά με* de K à la forme de salutation usuelle à la fin d'une lettre privée ou d'un décret royal, je crois que P. Roussel (l.c., pp. 147–148), auquel se rallie Peek (p. 158), avait raison de retrouver en K le salut final des hymnes grecs, avec cette différence que la déesse, qui prend ici la parole, ne peut se saluer elle-même, mais offre son salut à la terre d'Egypte.[55]

Entre le prélude (*φύσις, γένος*, lieu de culte) et la prière terminale, l'hymne homérique rapportait d'ordinaire la légende locale de la divinité; l'hymne hellénistique insiste plutôt sur sa toute puissance, ses *ἀρεταί* (cf. h. de Maiistas à Sarapis [Powell, p. 69: Délos, fin III^e s. av. J.C.], v.19–20 *πᾶν δὲ κατ' ἦμαρ | σὰς ἀρετὰς ἤειδεν*) ou ses *εὑρήματα*. Pour la toute puissance, l'hymne à Zeus de Cléanthe offre un parallèle remarquable. Entre l'invocation initiale (v. 1–6) et la prière finale (v. 31–39), toute la partie intermédiaire (v. 7–30) constitue une eulogie en l'honneur de l'omnipotence de Zeus, le thème étant annoncé au dernier vers du prélude: *σὸν κράτος αἰὲν ἀείσω*. Le morceau se divise en deux sections: (I) 7–13: Le monde, considéré dans son ensemble, obéit sans cesse au Vouloir divin qui le guide (7–8). A son service, Zeus a d'ailleurs le foudre tout puissant (9–11: cf. K *42 ἐγὼ κεραυνοῦ κυρία εἰμί*). (II) 14–30: De l'ensemble du monde, Cléanthe passe à chaque partie (15–16), pour s'arrêter plus particulièrement au cas de l'homme (17–30). Sur la terre comme au ciel et dans la mer, tout dépend de Zeus, sauf les crimes des méchants (16). Encore ces crimes eux-mêmes finissent-ils par se résorber dans le Bien universel (17–20). Que les méchants le veuillent ou non, le monde accomplit sa course: tout, en définitive, cède à Zeus (21–30).

Toute semblable est la disposition des arétalogies isiaques. Prélude (*3–11*) et salut final (*57*) encadrent pareillement un long morceau sur la toute puissance d'Isis (B^1 B^2): la seule

[55] Pour le salut à un *pays*, Roussel comparait déjà l'hymne IV (á Délos) de Callimaque: invocation à Délos, v.1 ss.; *χαῖρε* final, v.325.

différence d'avec l'hymne à Zeus est que, dans ce morceau, l'auteur a inséré une nouvelle section (C), relative aux *εὑρήματα*. Je reviendrai bientôt sur ce dernier trait, mais il convient de marquer dès maintenant la similitude entre l'arétalogie et l'hymne. Cette conformité apparaît jusque dans des détails de style. L'un des caractères de l'eulogie est de reprendre, sous un tour négatif ("rien ne se fait sans toi"), ce qui a été dit d'abord au positif ("tout se fait par toi").[56] Ainsi, dans l'hymne de Cléanthe, *οὐδέ τι γίγνεται . . . σοῦ δίχα, δαῖμον* (v.14) reprend *σοὶ δὴ πᾶς ὅδε κόσμος . . . πείθεται* (v.7); dans l'arétalogie isiaque de Cyrène (Peek, p. 129), *ἐμοῦ δὲ χωρὶς γείνετ' οὐδὲν πώποτε κτλ.* (v.15 ss.) reprend *καλοῦσι δή με πάντες ὑψίστην θεόν, κτλ.* (v.7 ss.); dans l'hymne à Hygie d'Epidaure (IG IV^2, 133 = hymne d'Ariphron de Sicyone, vers 400, Ath. XV 701) *σέθεν δὲ χωρὶς οὔ τις εὐδαίμων ἔφυ* (v.10) reprend *μετὰ σεῖο . . . τέθαλε πάντα καὶ λάμπει* (v. 8–9); les exemples d'ailleurs abondent dès Pindare, v.gr. Nem. VII 3 ss. *ἄνευ σέθεν . . . σὺν δὲ τίν, κτλ.* De même ici, *40 οὐθεὶς δοξάζεται ἄνευ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης* reprend sous forme négative ce que la déesse exprime ordinairement au positif: "Je suis maîtresse (*κυρία*) de tout." Ces reprises (anaphores), qui se rencontrent également sous la forme "tout ce que je décide s'accomplit, tout me cède" (46–47) ou "Je vaincs le destin, le destin m'obeit" (55–56), n'ont, quoi qu'en dise M. Harder (pp. 32–33), rien de spécifiquement égyptien. Il y a longtemps que Norden, dans son Agnostos Theos (pp. 355 ss.), a mis en garde contre la tendance à rapporter à l'Orient toute forme de parallélisme.

4) Quel est donc, en bref, le sens de ces arétalogies?

Dans l'épitaphe d'Osiris qui, d'après les historiens que mentionne Diodore (I 27), aurait existé à Nysa d'Arabie, le dieu déclare: "Il n'y a pas de lieu de la terre habitée où je ne sois allé et n'aie fait part à tous des arts dont j'ai été l'*inventeur* (*διαδοὺς πᾶσιν ὧν ἐγὼ εὑρετὴς ἐγενόμην*)". Dans l'arétalogie de Cyrène (Peek, p. 129: 103 ap. J.C.), v.9, Isis dit: "C'est moi qui ai *inventé* tous les arts (*ἀυτὴ γὰρ εὗρον πάντα*)". Dans l'arétalogie de Kymé (= Ios, Salonique + A^p), Isis est *inventrice* (*εὗρον, εὑροῦσα: γράμματα 3, καρπόν 7, θαλάσσια ἔργα 15,*

[56] Cf. K. Keyssner, op. cit., pp. 29, 36.

συγγραφὰς γαμικάς 30), *institutrice* (ἐνομοθέτησα: 4, 19, 29, 36; ἐθέμην, ἐπέθηκα, ἐπιτίθημι: 4, 20, 35; ἐποίησα: τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχυρόν 16 (= 28, 38); 32, 33; ἔταξα, συνεταξάμην, διεταξάμην: 14, 18, 31; ἠνάγκασα 27), *fondatrice* (ἐμοὶ ὠκοδομήθη, ἔκτισα, ἱδρυσάμην: 11, 24, 51), celle qui a *montré* (ἔδειξα, ἐπέδειξα: ἄστρων ὁδούς 13, μυήσεις 22) ou *enseigné* (ἐδίδαξα 23) la civilisation sous tous ses aspects. Or ce thème du dieu εὑρετής est, nous l'avons vu (cf. supra, p. 220), ancien. Il remonte au moins à Eschyle et il est peu probable qu'Eschyle l'ait trouvé le premier: on croira bien plutôt qu'il a rapporté à Prométhée une tradition déjà existante. Non seulement ce thème est ancien, mais il est curieux de voir que, lorsqu'il fait son apparition dans la littérature grecque, c'est déjà sous la même forme que dans les arétalogies isiaques, le dieu prenant la parole et exposant lui-même ce qu'il a fait pour l'humanité. Comparons en effet le morceau 436–506 du Prométhée, qu'on pourrait déjà nommer une arétalogie, avec le texte de Kymé. Comme Isis, Prométhée déclare qu'il est *l'inventeur* (ἐξηῦρον 460, οὔτις ἄλλος ἀντ' ἐμοῦ ηὗρε 467/8, ἐξευρών 469, τίς φήσειεν ἂν πάροιθεν ἐξευρεῖν ἐμοῦ 502/3, πᾶσαι τέχναι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως 506), *l'instituteur* (ἔννους ἔθηκα 444), le *fondateur* (ἐστοίχισα κἄκρινα πρῶτος 484/5) des divers arts humains, celui qui les a *montrés* (ἐγὼ ἔδειξα 457/8, ἐγὼ ἔδειξα 481/2), connus, distingués, machinés (ἐγνώρισα 487, διώρισα 489, οἵας τέχνας ἐμησάμην 477), apportés et donnés (ἤγαγον 465, δέδωκα 446) aux hommes.

D'autre part, il est intéressant d'observer en quelles circonstances Prométhée rappelle ainsi ses inventions: il le fait dans un dessein de défense et d'apologie, en vue de manifester l'indignité du traitement qu'il subit, de revendiquer ses droits d'ancien dieu contre les nouveaux dieux usurpateurs.[57] C'est également à l'occasion d'une rivalité entre le collège des technites athéniens et celui de l'Isthme que les Amphictions de Delphes, en 125 avant notre ère, reprendront à l'éloge d'Athènes le thème du πρῶτος εὑρετής:[58] "Attendu que le collège de technites a vu le

[57] Prom. 112–113: τοιῶνδε ποινὰς ἀμπλακημάτων τίνω | ὑπαιθρίοις δεσμοῖσι προυσελούμενος, 437–440: συννοίᾳ δὲ δάπτομαι κέαρ | ὁσῶν ἐμαυτὸν ὧδε προυσελούνεον. | καίτοι θεοῖσι τοῖς νέοις τούτοις γέρα | τίς ἄλλος ἢ 'γὼ παντελῶς διώρισεν;

[58] Cf. en dernier lieu G. Daux, Delphes au IIe et au Ier siècle (Paris, 1936), pp. 363 ss. Texte des considérants du décret, F.D., III 2, 69 (= Syll.³ 704 E), l. 11

jour et s'est rassemblé pour la première fois à Athènes,[59] dont le peuple, qui est à l'origine de tous les biens de l'humanité, a arraché les hommes à la vie sauvage pour les amener à la civilisation, a créé la vie sociale en répandant les mystères par lesquels il enseignait aux Grecs que le plus grand bien pour les hommes consiste dans des relations mutuelles de bonne foi, a transmis à l'humanité les lois divines sur la morale et sur l'éducation; ce peuple qui avait reçu pour lui-même la révélation du blé en répandit la pratique parmi les Grecs; c'est lui qui le premier a réuni un collège de technites et organisé des concours thymé-liques et scéniques, comme en témoignent la plupart des historiens et des poètes et comme le démontrent les faits eux-mêmes, puisque Athènes est la mère de l'art dramatique et a inventé et développé la tragédie et la comédie . . .". Comme le marque M. Daux (l.c., p. 370), "il faut voir dans l'hommage amphictionique, qui donne en quelque sorte une consécration officielle à un thème banal, une indication, parmi d'autres, sur la renaissance athénienne vers la fin du II[e] s. av. J.C." Et encore (p. 371): "Ils (ces considérants) contribuent à entretenir chez les Grecs la conscience de leur supériorité dans le domaine de la civilisation. ils participent à l'effort de renouveau, au réveil des traditions nationales et religieuses qui se manifeste en Grèce à ce moment."

N'avons-nous pas ici la clé de nos documents isiaques? Sans doute Isis n'est pas combattue. Il ne semble pas que son culte ait rencontré en Grèce la moindre opposition. Mais elle n'en est pas moins une déesse nouvelle qui cherche à prendre place dans un panthéon constitué depuis longtemps: elle est, d'une certaine manière, une rivale. Voilà pourquoi, lorsque, pour la première fois, elle se présente sur la scène (Εἶσις ἐγώ εἰμι), elle montre ses titres. Si, vers la même époque, Asklépios fait valoir son caractère de guérisseur (ἰατρός, σωτήρ: P.W., II 1677–1678) avant de devenir même un jour σωτὴρ τῶν ὅλων (ib. 1661–1662),

---

ss.: ib., p. 370 (n. 2 de la p. 369); traduction et commentaire: ib., pp. 369 ss. (j'ai reproduit cette traduction sauf deux légères modifications).

[59] ἐπειδὴ γεγονέναι καὶ συνειλέχθαι τεχνιτῶν σύνοδον παρ' Ἀθηναίοις συμβέβηκε πρῶτον. Plus tard, un autre décret amphictionique amplifiera la formule: Ces technites d'Athènes "ont été les premiers inventeurs de toute culture humaine et les fondateurs des concours scéniques" (πρώτους αὐτοὺς εὑρετὰς γεγονέναι πάσας παιδείας καὶ σκανικῶν ἀγώνων κτιτάς), Syll.[3] 711 L (106/5) = 728 K (97/6).

si le Dionysos hellénistique sera essentiellement le dieu Βάκχος (ou Βάκχιος ou Βακχεύς) des mystères qui s'identifie avec ses mystes (βάκχοι ou βάκχαι: Quandt, de Baccho, ind. cognominum), Isis se donne comme maîtresse (κυρία) toute-puissante et comme εὑρέτις. Elle s'attribue ainsi les privilèges de Zeus (*42* ἐγὼ κεραυνοῦ κυρία εἰμι: cf. l'hymne de Cléanthe), le grand dieu des Grecs, et tout ensemble de la déesse éleusinienne, qui a donné aux hommes le grain et les initiations, ou de Prométhée, le héros honoré à Athènes, qui a civilisé l'humanité.

On peut donc croire, semble-t-il, que ces arétalogies isiaques proviennent d'un dessein de mission. Il est loisible de penser que des prêtres d'Egypte [60] ont songé à répandre "l'évangile" d'Isis dans le monde grec.[61] Tout naturellement ils ont dû chercher la forme la plus susceptible d'attirer des adorateurs à leur déesse. Le goût du jour, qui portait d'une part à faire de chaque divinité élue un Souverain universel [62] et d'autre part à célébrer dans les dieux les premiers εὑρεταί (cf. le Zeus d'Evhémère), les a induits à choisir ces deux traits dans la représentation d'Isis. Ainsi s'expliqueraient le plus naturellement, à mon sens, le fond et la composition des arétalogies isiaques.

Ce fond, dans l'ensemble, est grec. Sans doute, pour donner au document une saveur exotique et d'ailleurs laisser à Isis son caractère propre, l'auteur a-t-il mêlé au texte quelques traits plus spécifiquement indigènes: outre les *personalia* évidemment, dans le prélude, Isis Sôthis (*9*), Isis dame de Boubastis (*11*), certains détails de mythologie égyptienne: séparation du ciel et de la terre (*12*), Isis logée dans les rayons solaires (*44*) et

[60] Plus probablement que le gouvernement ptolémaïque lui-même. Voir sur ce point les prudentes réserves de P. Roussel, Cultes égyptiens à Délos, pp. 239 ss., RHLR, VII, 1921, pp. 37–39.

[61] C'est un prêtre égyptien qui en introduit le culte à Délos; en revanche, la fondation d'un Sarapiéion, dont parle la lettre de Zoïlos d'Aspendos à Apollonios (Zenon Pap., I (1925), n° 59034: 257 av. J.C.), est le fait d'une initiative privée.

[62] Cf. l'hymne de Cléanthe passim, l'hymne anonyme à la Fortune (IV[e] s. av. J.C.: Berl. Kl. Texte, V 2, p. 142 = Edmonds, Lyra Graeca, III, p. 482), v.2 παγκρατὴς Τύχα. Noter ici v.15 πάντων γὰρ ἀρχὰν καὶ τέλος ἄκρον ἔχεις et dans l'hymne cité par Stobée (I 6.13, t.I, p. 86 W.), v.1 Τύχα, μερόπων ἀρχὰ καὶ τέρμα, formule qui n'est ailleurs employée que pour Zeus. Voir aussi l'invocation de Lucrèce à Venus Genetrix (sûrement d'après un modèle grec), I 21–23: *quae quoniam rerum naturam sola gubernas | nec sine te quicquam dias in luminis oras | exoritur.*

parèdre du soleil en sa course (*45*).[63] Le reste s'inspire d'idées grecques ou en tout cas s'explique aisément par des idées grecques: aussi bien, puisque le document est fait pour des Grecs (c'est en pays grec qu'on en a découvert les copies), et qu'il vise à montrer en Isis une divinité supérieure ou du moins égale aux dieux grecs, on eût manqué le but si les *ἀρεταί* d'Isis n'avaient eu de sens qu'aux bords du Nil. De fait, les "inventions" d'Isis sont celles dont se glorifient les Grecs ou qu'ils rapportent à des dieux grecs. C'est à l'endroit de ces dieux grecs qu'Isis se pose en rivale; elle revendique ce qui lui appartient: elle-même, et nul autre, a fondé la civilisation.

Plus encore que les idées, la composition est grecque. Elle se rattache à un genre bien défini, celui de l'hymne, elle conserve la disposition habituelle aux hymnes grecs hellénistiques. Quant à la forme *ἐγώ εἰμι*, elle paraît sans doute orientale par la répétition indéfinie d'un même tour.[64] Observons néanmoins que Prométhée avait employé déjà ce mode d'affirmation personnelle: ce qui doit être oriental ici, c'est la monotonie dans la répétition plus que l'affirmation elle-même.

Dans ces conditions, on ne voit nullement la nécessité d'un modèle égyptien. Il n'y a aucune preuve certaine que ce modèle ait existé et la nature du texte grec n'oblige point à en supposer l'existence. Tout conduit à penser que des prêtres égyptiens (de Memphis ou d'ailleurs) ont fait rédiger par un Grec (ou par un des leurs qui savait le grec), pour les Grecs, en conformité avec des idées grecques et un genre littéraire grec, une eulogie d'Isis destinée à munir la déesse d'une sorte de *symbolon* dans son voyage à travers le monde grec. Cet original grec a pu être une stèle, gravée à Memphis ou ailleurs. Il a pu aussi bien n'être qu'une feuille volante. Peut-être les prêtres qui se rendaient en Grèce pour assurer le service cultuel auprès d'une colonie de leurs compatriotes (le cas d'Apollonios et de sa dynastie à Délos est le plus typique) en emportaient-ils avec eux la copie. Les arétalogies de Kymé et de Cyrène ont été trouvées dans les ruines de temples d'Isis; M. Harder (pp. 5 et 57) déduit de celle de

[63] Peut-être aussi *48 ἐγὼ τοὺς ἐν δέσμοις λύω*: mais est-il sûr qu'il s'agisse de liens magiques?

[64] Sur ce point, cf. Norden, Agn. Theos, pp. 186 ss. Je n'ai pu consulter la dissertation d'Ed. Schweizer, Ego eimi, Göttingen, 1939.

Karpokrate à Chalkis l'existence d'un temple des dieux égyptiens en cette ville: il n'est pas défendu de conclure de même pour celles d'Isis à Ios, Andros et Salonique. On notera que l'aréta-logie de Kymé suit une dédicace à Isis, celle de Cyrène une dédicace à Isis et Sarapis, celle d'Ios une dédicace à Isis, Osiris, Anoubis, Karpokrate, celle de Chalkis une dédicace à Karpo-krate, Sarapis, aux oreilles d'Isis, à Osiris, à Hestia, etc.; la dédicace de Cyrène est le fait d'un néocore d'Isis, celle de Kymé d'un certain Démétrios, fils d'Artémidore, de Magnésie-du-Méandre.[65]

Les inscriptions qui nous livrent le texte sont en général tar-dives: la plus ancienne, celle d'Andros, doit être du I^er^ siècle avant notre ère (comme Diodore); celle de Cyrène, la seule datée, est de 103 ap. J.C.; celles de Kymé et de Salonique peuvent être du I/II^e^ s., celle d'Ios du II/III^e^ s., celle de Chalkis du III/IV^e^ s. Mais l'original paraît bien avoir été composé encore à l'époque hellénistique, peut-être au début du III^e^ siècle. Il reflète les modes du temps, notamment l'engouement pour les dieux εὑρεταί. A l'inverse, on n'y rencontre pas la myrionymie d'Isis qui deviendra un dogme caractéristique de l'époque gréco-romaine (cf. P. Oxy. XI 1380: I^er^ s. ap. J.C.; Apulée, Métam. XI); une autre absence remarquable, déjà notée par P. Roussel (l.c., pp. 166–168), est le manque de tout ce qui regarde la vie future: l'Isis que montrent nos textes n'est pas encore la *regina manium* dont les promesses consolent Lucius dans le roman d'Apulée. Si le document, dans son ensemble, peut donc remonter à l'âge hellénistique, je croirais volontiers pour ma part que les deux derniers versets, *précisément les deux derniers*, qu'il était loisible d'ajouter à un texte préexistant: "Je vaincs l'Heimarnénè, l'Heimarménè m'obéit" (*55–56*), sont une addition tardive. Sans

[65] Le nom par lui-même ne prouve pas qu'il s'agisse d'un Grec, et non d'un prêtre, égyptien: cf. le cas de l'Apollonios de Délos, ὢν Αἰγύπτιος ἐκ τῶν ἱερέων qui, vers le début du III^e^ s., apporta de Memphis des objets sacrés très anciens (αὐτὸς δ' οἱ δηναιὰ πατὴρ ἐκόμισσεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς Μέμφιδος, IG. XI 1299, 37–38); il a pour fils et successeur un Démétrios, et celui-ci un second Apollonios. Néan-moins, il se peut que le Démétrios dédicant de l'arétalogie de Kymé ait été un dévot d'Isis grec. Songeons en ce cas que, l'inscription étant longue, la gravure en devait être coûteuse. On comprendrait donc que le prêtre local, qui sans doute détenait le document, profitât des bonnes dispositions d'un dévot grec pour faire graver le texte.

doute la notion du joug de l'Heimarménè s'impose dès la fin du IV^e^ siècle, témoin Epicure (III 133–134). Mais que certains dieux soient plus puisants que la Fatalité et puissent en briser les liens, c'est là une idée liée à des vues cosmologiques et astrologiques dont on n'a pas trace, semble-t-il, avant la fin de l'ère païenne.[66] En ce qui regarde les dieux d'Egypte, j'en trouve les premières mentions dans l'arétalogie d'Andros, puis dans le roman d'Apulée (XI 6, 15, 25) et le curieux papyrus de Berlin sur Sarapis *σωτήρ* qui délivre de la Moire: or ce texte est du II^e^ ou III^e^ s. de notre ère et P. Roussel observait justement à son sujet: [67] "On croira difficilement que de telles conceptions aient pénétré la religion de Sarapis dès l'époque de Ptolémée Philadelphe: elles sont mieux à leur place au II^e^ s. ap. J.C."

[66] On ne peut descendre plus bas, puisque l'hymne d'Andros, et donc son modèle en prose, contient déjà ce trait, cf. v.171 ss. Or cet hymne paraît être de l'époque d'Auguste.

[67] RHLR, VII, 1921, p. 41.

DR. WATTS' "FLIGHTS OF FANCY"

ROBERT STEVENSON
Princeton, New Jersey

The year 1948 drew to a close with a spate of articles appearing in religious magazines honoring the memory of Watts. Along with the King James Version, Dr. Watts' hymns have become a symbol of Protestantism's underlying unity in a day of proliferating denominations. Around his hymns there now cluster historic associations and fond memories that endear Watts to the entire Protestant community.

The keynote of many of the commemorative articles stressed Watts' unique position as the "founder" of the English hymn. As with so many generalizations, this concept of Watts as the first hymn-writer provides an over-simplification of his essential achievement. During his own lifetime Watts "could have compiled an English hymn book out of existing materials, whose excellence would not be questioned today." [1] The distinctive achievement of Dr. Watts was not his fathering of the English hymn; hymns by Herbert, Herrick, Donne, Ken, Baxter, many of them suitable for congregational singing, had been written long before Watts issued his first volume of Hymns in 1707. How then shall we account for the prevalent tendency to accredit Watts with the distinctive title: "Father of the English Hymn?"

Comparatively few persons in our day realize that Watts came on the scene at a time when violent antipathies against hymn-singing existed in Established and Dissenting Churches both in England and in Scotland. The prejudice against hymn-singing as a part of congregational worship drew impetus from a reading or mis-reading of New Testament injunctions on the conduct of public worship. In Watts' day, sanctified by an unbroken custom handed down from the middle of the sixteenth century, the singing of Psalms of David and certain other Scriptural canticles furnished the only congregational exercise allowed in the vast majority of churches. Watts' peculiar mission was the undermining

[1] Percy Dearmer, Songs of Praise Discussed, London, 1933, p. xvii.

of this long-established custom and, paradoxically enough, the petard he used was his own Psalms of David Imitated in the Language of the New Testament. Watts' "Imitations" were imitations in the eighteenth century sense, and David provided him only with a convenient and acceptable point of departure. He proceeded on the theory that "by keeping too close to David in the House of God, the Vail of Moses is thrown over our Hearts." [2] Sensing the restiveness of English congregations who chafed under the "Vail of Moses," good Dr. Watts set about "correcting and refining" the royal bard's poetry.

His excuse for correcting and refining David's rhapsodic effusions was contained in the preface to this 1719 volume. David's poetry, Watts tells us, frequently betrays a certain "cloudy Jewishness" (and here "Jewishness" is demonstrably a term of opprobrium) which must be remedied by the injection of the "clearer revelations" of the Gospel. Watts excises David's cloudy Jewishness in Psalm II and gives his improved version the title, "Christ's Dying, Interceding, and Reigning." Psalm VIII becomes a poem entitled "Adam and Christ, Lords of the Old and New Creation." Psalm XIII is entitled "The Promise and Sign of Christ's Coming." "Christ's All-Sufficiency" is the title of Psalm XVI, and so it goes throughout the whole volume.

No doubt these changes accorded with eighteenth century exegesis of the Book of Psalms. The charming thing about all this is, however, the self-deception in which the churches blithely indulged themselves. Accepting the singing of the Book of Psalms as a divinely revealed, immutable ordinance, the churches nevertheless re-echoed a long amen after Watts' tirade against the royal psalmist. By the end of the eighteenth century, as one critic put the case, "Christian congregations [had] shut out divinely inspired Psalms," and in their place had "taken in Dr. Watts' flights of fancy," [3] always proceeding, of course, on the theory that the singing of David's Psalms constituted a divinely revealed ordinance. In the period of the Great Awakening, this procedure enabled the churches to have their cake and eat it too. The con-

[2] I. Watts, Hymns and Spiritual Songs . . . . With an Essay Towards the Improvement of Christian Psalmody . . . . London, 1707, p. v.

[3] William Romaine, The Whole Works, London, 1787, p. 990.

servatives were able to solace themselves with the comforting thought that they were adhering to the faith once delivered to the saints, and the evangelizers meanwhile rejoiced in the possession of a large body of poems which stressed the cardinal truths of the gospel. Watts, who was no paltry scholar, knew always just what he was doing: "If some readers should suppose the English verse here to mistake the Hebrew sense, yet perhaps these evangelical allusions . . . may be [more] agreeable and useful to the Christian worshipper." [4] So he expressed himself in a typical footnote appended to his "Imitations." And more agreeable and useful these "Imitations" did prove to be at Northampton where during some strange and surprising occurrences they first found usage in Jonathan Edwards' congregation, in Georgia where John Wesley using them roused the ire of certain colonists of the bitter-end school, and in England at first in the houses of Dissent, and eventually in the staider churches of the Establishment after the fruitage of the Evangelical movement manifested itself.

Watts, who repeatedly expressed his admiration for John Dryden, patterned his psalm-imitations on earlier models of imitation found in the works of Cowley (the Pindaric imitations) and of Dryden. Dryden's definition of imitation is relevant: "I take imitation (Preface to the Translation of Ovid's Epistles) . . . to be an endeavor of a later poet to write like one who has written before him, on the same subject; that is, not to translate his words, or to be confined to his sense, but only to set him a pattern, and to write as he supposes the author would have done, had he lived in our age, and in our country." [5] In one of Watts' less known poems, an imitation of Horace, he avails himself of gross anachronisms of the sort which Dryden sanctions in his definition of "imitation."

But the really grand-scale application of Dryden's theory of imitation was not Watts' re-hash of Horace, but rather this chef-d'oeuvre which has occupied our attentions thus far, Psalms of David Imitated. Here Watts applied Dryden's theory of imitation with a vengeance. And we now proceed to an itemized account of

[4] I. Watts, The Works of the late Reverend and Learned Isaac Watts . . . . Now first published from his Manuscripts . . . . revised and corrected by D. Jennings . . . and . . . P. Doddridge . . . . London, 1753, vol. IV, p. 79.

[5] Flora R. Amos, Early Theories of Translation, New York, 1920, p. 151.

Watts' bill for the refurbishing of the royal author. When he got through with David's Psalms, he had cavalierly omitted as "unworthy of paraphrase" a dozen Psalms, and in the consummation of his announced plan to make "David speak like an eighteenth century British Christian," [6] had so altered a score of others as to render them utterly unrecognizable.

Watts highly disapproved of the vengeful, vindictive note struck in many of the Psalms of David. In random footnotes throughout the "Imitations" we find such comments as these: "I have here omitted the dreadful imprecations on his enemies"; [7] "Rejoicing in the destruction of our personal enemies is not so evangelical a practice, therefore I have given this verse [of the Psalm] another turn"; [8] "The particular complaints of David against Achitophel here are entirely omitted . . . I have also left out some whole Psalms . . . that tend to fill the mind with overwhelming sorrows or sharp resentment"; [9] — and Watts therefore in his own delightful way goes about brightening "by the clearer discoveries of the gospel" the "Composures of the Jewish psalmist."

In his endeavor to bring David up to date, Watts furthermore changes the Psalms in order to harmonize them with prevailing economic attitudes of the eighteenth century. Where the psalmist had scored usury, Watts with egregious solicitude for the consciences of his contemporaries "thought it necessary also to leave out the mention of usury, which though politically forbidden by the Jews among themselves (ah, fine distinction!) was never unlawful to the Gentiles, nor to any Christians since the Jewish polity expired." [10] Watts, who throughout his long life always preferred to live at the sumptuous country estate of a former London alderman (his health no doubt demanded the country air), tactfully omitted the mention of those temporal blessings which the royal psalmist repeatedly promised the righteous, because as he

[6] John Dryden, in his preface to the Aeneid, had announced a similar purpose: "I have endeavored to make Virgil speak such English as he would himself have spoken if he had been born in England and in this present age." (The Works of John Dryden, Scott-Saintsbury, ed., Edinburgh, 1889, vol. XIV, p. 220.)

[7] Watts, The Works (1753), vol. IV, p. 66.

[8] Ibid., vol. IV, p. 86.

[9] Ibid., vol. IV, p. 54.

[10] I. Watts, The Psalms of David Imitated in the Language of the New Testament, London, 1719, p. 39.

expressed it, he believed in "discouraging a too confident expectation of these temporal things, . . . the positive blessings of long life, health, recovery, and security in the midst of dangers . . . so much promised in the Old Testament, and so little in the New." [11] Better he considered it would be for the "vulgar Christians, the meanest of 'em," as he patronizingly referred to them in the preface to the 1719 volume, to concentrate on the promise of "heavenly hopes, more agreeable to the Gospel." [12]

The happy land of Canaan in Watts' "Imitations" becomes the British Isles. While he is tenderly excising the Davidic promises of such personal blessings as long life, health, recovery, and security amidst dangers, because these promises are omitted in the New Testament, he nevertheless allows himself extravagant liberties in magnifying stray hints of Canaan's blessings into huge prophecies of Britain's future greatness. Promise of personal blessings, no — this might lead the vulgar sort astray with false hopes — but promise of national blessings, there indeed was a theme on which Watts found heart and tongue to expatiate. Consider his version of Psalm LXVII: "Shine, mighty God, on Britain shine . . . . God the Redeemer scatters round His choicest favors here . . . . Sing loud with solemn voice, While British tongues exalt His praise, And British hearts rejoice!" [13] Psalm LXXV is worthy of quotation in its entirety, but we abridge:

> Britain was doomed to be a slave,
> Her frame dissolved, her fears were great;
> When God a new supporter gave
> To bear the pillars of the state . . . .
>
> Let haughty sinners sink their pride,
> Nor lift so high their scornful head;
> But lay their foolish thoughts aside,
> And own the King that God hath made.
>
> Such honors never come by chance,
> Nor do the winds promotion blow;
> 'Tis God the judge doth one advance
> 'Tis God that lays another low.

[11] Watts, The Works (1753), vol. IV, p. 40.
[12] Ibid., vol. IV, p. 40.
[13] Watts, The Psalms (1719), p. 170.

No vain pretence to royal birth
Shall fix a tyrant on the throne;
God the great Sovereign of the earth
Will rise and make his justice known . . . .[14]

The title of this inimitable masterpiece pays a double-barrelled salute: "Power and government from God alone, applied to the Glorious Revolution by King William, or the happy accession of King George to the throne." In another place he has the temerity to call King George II a "royal saint," and at his accession had penned an execrable couplet: " 'Tis George the Blest remounts the throne, With double vigor in his son." [15] No wonder Walpole rewarded this kind of sentiment with a liberal royal gift cunningly bestowed for the relief of indigent widows of Dissenting clergymen — without, however, lifting his finger for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.

Watts, in a version of Psalm C, gives us this stanza:

Sing to the Lord with joyful voice
Let every land his name adore;
The British Isles shall send the noise
Across the ocean to the shore . . . .[16]

And we find Psalm CIV developing a similar theme: " O bless his name, ye Britons!" [17] Psalm CXV exhorts: "O Britain, trust the Lord." [18] And Psalm CXLVII elaborates reasons for praising and trusting the Lord: "O Britain, praise thy mighty God . . . . He bid the ocean round thee flow; No bars of brass could guard thee so." [19] A little later in this last poem Watts derives considerable satisfaction from the contrast of British customs with foreign ones: "He [God] hath nobler ways," so Watts comfortably concludes, "To call the Britons to his praise."

Not content with justifying the ways of God to the British in England alone, Watts found a new title for the last part of Psalm

[14] Ibid., pp. 195–6.
[15] I. Watts, D. D., Reliquiae Juveniles; Miscellaneous Thoughts in Prose and Verse . . . . Glasgow, 1786, p. 219.
[16] Watts, The Psalms (1719), p. 256.
[17] Ibid., p. 271.
[18] Ibid., p. 303.
[19] Ibid., pp. 386–7.

CVII: "Colonies planted; or Nations blest and punish'd; A Psalm for New England." Two stanzas give an idea of the author's manner in this compliment to the New World:

> Where nothing dwelt but beasts of prey,
> Or men as fierce and wild as they,
> He bids th' oprest and poor repair,
> And builds them towns and cities there.
>
> Thus they are blest; but if they sin,
> He lets the heathen nations in,
> A savage crew invades their lands,
> Their princes die by barb'rous hands.[20]

Doubtless there were some New Englanders who thanked him for his brightening of this particular Psalm with the clearer revelations of the Gospel, for here indeed he showed skill in lifting the Vail of Moses.

There were, however, scholars abroad in the land even during the eighteenth century who preferred David to Watts. "Compared to the Scripture," wrote one conscientious divine, "they are like a little taper to the Sun; as for his Psalms, they are so far from the mind of the Spirit, that I am sure if David were to read them, he would not know anyone of them to be his." [21] And the same author continues: "Why should Dr. Watts . . . not only take precedence of the Holy Ghost, but thrust him entirely out of the Church? Insomuch that the rhymes of a man are now magnified above the word of God." [22] By the time these criticisms reached the public (the year before the American Revolution) Watts had won the vast majority of English and American churches to his side, and his Trojan Horse technique had finally opened the closely guarded gates of the Christian system of praise; where formerly the singing of divinely-appointed Psalms of David formed the sole vehicle of congregational praise, first his poems masquerading as Psalms of David were wheeled within the Christian walls, and then, ah woe! emerged the full flood-tide of "hymns of human composure." Let it be remembered that in the volume of Psalm-Imitations

[20] Ibid., p. 286.
[21] W. Romaine, op. cit., p. 999.
[22] Ibid., p. 990.

(which he placed before the public in 1719) were such "psalms" as the great missionary favorite of congregations today: "Jesus Shall Reign Where'er the Sun," certainly an advantageous hymn, but hardly Psalm LXXII. And "Joy to the World," the well-known Christmas favorite, hardly deserves to be called a version of Psalm XCVIII when the words contain even less of David than the tune does of Handel (only the first four notes of the melody are Handelian).

No wonder such a multitude of Christians found David a more palatable dish in the ragout served by the master-chef, Watts. After all, it was only the rooted prejudice against "hymns of human composure" that had forced him to serve up a dish entitled Psalms of David, anyway; and he clearly revealed his general discontent with the poor side-shoulder of beef he had worked up into such a luscious dish when he wrote confidentially to a friend, Dr. Colman of Boston, some twenty years after the publication of his "Imitations": "I must say that I imitated David's Psalms, not as the fittest book that could be made for Christian worship, but as the best which the churches would yet hearken to." [23]

Writing to the same friend again, Watts further emphasized his general stand: "I see the sense of the people of New England, how necessary it is to sing something Jewish and something personal belonging to David . . . . But I repeat these words out of my preface to the large edition of my Imitation of the Psalms (here, let us notice again his insistence on the term 'imitation'), 'Still I am bold to maintain the great principle on which my present work is founded, and that is, that if the brightest genius on earth or an angel from heaven should translate David, and keep close to the sense and style of the inspired author, we would only attain thereby a bright or heavenly copy of the devotion of the *Jewish* (Watts' italics) King, but it would never make the fittest song-book for a Christian people.' " [24]

With Alexander Pope in his famous translation of Homer, it would appear that Watts shared the honor of having made some very pretty poems, but he had less justification than Pope in at-

[23] Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings, 2nd series, vol. IX, Boston, 1895, p. 365.

[24] Ibid., p. 365.

taching the name of another author to his pretty poems, because, unlike Pope, he set about his task consumed with little inner loyalty to the Davidic material, but only because he found the churches would "hearken to nothing" without the Davidic title. In this case it was not a case of the rose smelling as sweet by another name, but rather another flower by the name of rose smelling sweeter. Watts achieved the end he sought to encompass. What Dr. Johnson said on another occasion of Pope might just as well have been referred to Dr. Watts: "To a thousand cavils one answer is necessary; the purpose of a writer is to be read, and the criticism which would destroy the power of pleasing must be blown aside." [25]

We may cavil along with Dante Gabriel Rossetti who a century ago expressed his ideas on "pleasing" when he wrote: "The work of a translator is one of some self-denial. . . . Sometimes a flaw in the work galls him (and how many flaws did not Watts find with the 'cloudy Jewishness' of the royal bard), and he would fain remove it, doing for the poet that which his age denied him; but no — it is not in the bond." [26] To us, nowadays, "there seems a real question of intellectual honesty involved," and we feel that we must "beware lest a translation of a man's work be not really a questionable procuring, not to say a forging, of his signature to some modern manifesto," [27] but all such cavils, if we are to follow Dr. Johnson, must be blown aside if fidelity to the meaning of the author "destroys the power of pleasing."

A popular balladeer of the early eighteenth century expressed the idea:

> Hang Homer and Virgil; their meaning to seek,
> A man must have poked into Latin and Greek;
> Those who love their own tongue, we have reason to hope
> Have read them translated by Dryden and Pope.[28]

Fortunately for Watts there were spirits abroad in the land with a similar hankering after an improvement in the matter composed by the royal psalmist. Along with Thomas Otway, who a genera-

[25] F. R. Amos, op. cit., p. 165.
[26] Quotation in Amos, D. G. Rossetti, Preface to Translations, n. d., p. xiv.
[27] J. S. Phillimore, Some Remarks on Translation and Translators, Oxford, 1919, p. 16.
[28] Amos, op. cit., p. 173.

tion earlier had praised another "translator," Watts' friends and admirers agreed:

> For when the rich original we peruse
> And by it try the metal you produce,
> Though there indeed the purest ore we find,
> Yet still by you it something is refined.[29]

And Watts, himself, would no doubt have agreed that he refined the ore, though in view of his patent contempt for the miserable Jewishness of David's poetry, and his joyous élan in lifting the "Vail of Moses," it seems possible that he would have resented the phrase, "*purest* ore." [30]

As important as were the Psalm-imitations, the climax of Watts' poetic career, yet any just estimate of his achievement in verse must at least comprehend two other principal volumes, Horae Lyricae (1706), and Hymns and Spiritual Songs (1707). And to these ought to be added, perhaps, a third volume which eventually attained an astounding vogue, Divine and Moral Songs (1715), a collection of hymns for children. Horae Lyricae contains his most ambitious literary efforts; in it occurs, for instance, The Day of Judgment, an Ode, in English Sapphic. This poem, nowadays frequently reprinted in college anthologies, trenchantly summarizes the familiar scene; there is startling verve and vitality in the language, and the cumulative effect commands the reader's respect. It may be in order to observe that in this volume, Watts' first collection of verse, the title-page bristles not with any of those Scripture quotations which hallow the title-pages of his succeeding volumes of poetry, but rather vouches for the author's Latinity in a brief paraphrase from Horace, adding impressiveness with a snatch of Pythagoras (of doubtful relevancy to the material in hand it may be noted, however).

The first edition of the Horae Lyricae contained Watts' first four Psalm-imitations (I in Long Meter, III in Common Meter, C in Long Meter, and CXXXIII in Common Meter); [31] also

[29] Ibid., p. 156.

[30] Throughout this discussion the name "David" has been used generically to designate the authors of the Biblical Psalms, in the same sense in which "Homer" is designated the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey.

[31] These four Psalm-imitations were copied almost exactly from the 1706 volume into the 1719 volume. As example of the kind of change Watts made, we quote a

included was a bathetic piece entitled "An Hymn of Praise to the God of England for Three Great Salvations, I. From the Spanish Invasion, 1588 II. From the Gunpowder Plot, November 5 III. From Popery and Slavery by King William of Glorious Memory, who landed November 5, 1688." This effusion Watts dated November 5, 1695. The God of England theme, as we have seen at length, gets the full organ treatment with all stops pulled out, in his later poetry.

A theme which he developed with tremolo and harp registration in his early Horae Lyricae, but which his later considered judgment told him to avoid, is the Divine Love theme. If he did not recognize the bathos of the God of England theme, at least he later had perspicuity enough to discard the language of physical rapture which pervades the Divine Love poems in his 1706 volume. Thirty years afterwards he apologized for the grossness of imagery in these particular poems. Long before Freud, Watts, a confirmed bachelor, came to sense the dangers of incorporating expressions of physical rapture into poetry addressed to the Almighty.[32] In 1737 he wrote: "I know it hath been said that this language of rapture addressed to Deity is but a new track given to the flow of the softer powers, after the disappointment of some meaner lover; or, at least, it is owing to the want of a proper object and opportunity to fix those tender passions." [33]

John Wesley, who admired Watts, nevertheless felt considerable repugnance after reading these poems of Divine Love. A friend of his, John Wesley recounted, called the Divine Love poems

---

stanza first from the 1706 volume, and below it the same stanza from the 1719 volume:

(1706) p. 61 'Tis like the Oyl on Aaron shed
Which choice Perfumes compose,
Down softly from his Reverend Head
It trickled to his Toes.

(1719) p. 35 'Tis like the Oyl divinely sweet
On Aaron's reverend Head,
The trickling Drops perfum'd his Feet,
And o'er his Garments spread.

In the actual singing of the last line of this stanza "trickled to his Toes" lined out alone might have caused some hesitation, or perhaps merriment.

[32] The language of physical rapture occurs frequently in the mystical religious poetry of the preceding century. See, for instance, Richard Crashaw's Hymn to the Name and Honour of the Admirable Saint Teresa.

[33] Arthur P. Davis, Isaac Watts, New York, 1943, p. 177.

"too amorous, and fitter to be addressed by a lover to his fellow mortal than by a sinner to the most high God." [34] With this judgment Wesley concurred. Watts, "who knew Christ after the flesh," according to Wesley, offended "in a more gross manner, than in anything which was before published in the English tongue," — no mild censure! "What pity is it, that those coarse expressions should appear in many truly spiritual hymns! How often, in the midst of excellent verse, are lines inserted which disgrace those that precede and follow." Wesley assures us that in his own collections of hymns he has "particularly endeavored, in all the hymns addressed to our blessed Lord, to avoid every fondling expression, and to speak as to the most high God. . . . Some will probably think that I have been over scrupulous (he expunged 'Jesus, Lover of My Soul' from the Methodist Collection on this very account, even though his brother wrote the hymn). . . . I never myself either in verse or prose, in praying or preaching use the word dear, 'Dear Lord,' or 'Dear Saviour'. . . . There is no precedent for, or justification of addressing it ('dear') to Christ." [35]

Watts liked the term "dear," and within a dozen pages we find such expressions as "my dearest Lord," [36] "the dear Man my Saviour," [37] "the Man I love," [38] "Dear Sovereign." [39] Watts' heart dissolves in ecstasy as he contemplates "those sweet Lips, that Heavenly Look," those sweet lips that "seek my kisses and my Love." [40] Christ "stands and prays to clasp me to his Heart." [41] "His lovely Form meets every dream," while "the Passion reigns thro' all my Veins." [42] The amatory strain continues with Watts' imploring Christ to dwell with him: "Dwell there, for ever dwell, my Love; . . . . Let me be lost in thine Embrace as Rivers in the Sea; Or Live Eternity of Days to spend

[34] John Wesley, The Works of the Rev. John Wesley, New York, 1856, vol. II, p. 443.
[35] Ibid., p. 444.
[36] I. Watts, Horae Lyricae, Poems Chiefly of the Lyric Kind, London, 1706, p. 67.
[37] Ibid., p. 70.
[38] Ibid., p. 75.
[39] Ibid., p. 79.
[40] Ibid., p. 80.
[41] Ibid., p. 81.
[42] Ibid., p. 83.

them all with Thee." [43] "Still I would lie in those dear Arms Dissolving still among thy Charms," continues Watts, "And as the moments fly, I'de Breathe away successive Souls." Remembering the connotation of the word "die," in eighteenth century amatory verse, we see Watts dissolving in the dear arms of Christ like the "Billow [that] after Billow rolls to kiss the Shoar, and Dye." [44]

Such surfeit of passion overlades these Divine Love poems that adequate quotation might consume pages of print. There is a delectable poem entitled "The Absence of the Beloved," in which Watts gives free flow to "the softer powers," as he spoke of them thirty years later. Another amorous flight is called "Sick of Love," in which the reader is given to understand that Watts is sick by reason of an overcharge of love. "Tell me thou fairest of thy Kind," he asks Christ, "My Love, my All-Divine, Where may this fainting Head reclin'd Relieve such Cares as mine?" He compares his love-sick condition with that of "the Sick'ning Sheep [who] to Coverts fly." The sheep are "not half so scorch't as I thus languishing in Love." [45] It indeed seems that Wesley may not have shot very wide of the mark when he declared Watts had offended "in a more gross manner, than in anything which was before published in the English tongue."

Continuing in the same love-sick train Watts tells us "the dear Flame is Charming Sweet, I would not cool the Passion yet, Nor can I bear the pain." Between a desire to enjoy the dear flame so charming sweet and the pain the burning causes, "Strangly I'm Rack't in wide Extremes, I burn, I burn, I burn, and yet I love the Flames." A little later while he is still burning, burning, burning, he asks, "Oh why is Love so strong and Nature's self so weak?" He pleads with his Christ: "Dear Lord, forgive my rash Complaint and Love me still. . . . Unvail thy Beauties tho' I faint." [46] Perhaps it was the wished-for unveiling which gave Watts such confidence a decade later when he set about lifting the "Vail of Moses" from the royal psalmist's muse! He decides in a later poem, "I'le carve our Passion on the Bark," and then the "wounded trees" will "drop and bear some Mystick Mark." He

[43] Ibid., p. 84.
[44] Ibid., p. 84.
[45] Ibid., p. 86.
[46] Ibid., p. 87.

continues his pleading, "Look down, Almighty Grace, Prison me round in thine Embrace." [47] Were it not for questionable taste in the manner of addressing this poetry to Christ, one might even take considerable delight in the sentiments which Watts is able to extract from the Song of Songs.

His attitude towards Christ may in large measure have reflected his own belief in the everlasting humanity of Christ. We leave Watts' poetry built on themes from the Song of Songs, then, and turn to our last consideration — his idea of the Glorified Humanity of Christ. Perhaps in his unforeseen attitude toward the Humanity of Christ we find another clue in our attempt to unravel a fascinating personality, and a brilliant if not always profound mind.

Watts' essay on the Glorified Humanity of Christ forms but a small niche in the total library of his prose works. Nowadays, of course, his prose is never read, but there was a time when his essay on Logic formed the text for a course in that subject at Oxford. And there was a time when his Philosophical Essays were read and admired. Mrs. Piozzi, Dr. Johnson's benefactress, after reading the Philosophical Essays wrote: "Sweet Modest Watts! he is a writer by no means *Meaner* than Locke. He is greater, because his Mind took in *more* sciences; he had a larger capacity." [48] In New England, where his prose works early came into the possession of both Harvard and Yale Colleges, his Logic text was referred to as a "beauteous system," and the author was apostrophized as "Divinest Watts." [49] There, too, his Philosophical Essays met with unctuous approval.[50]

The students at Yale, however, were not exposed to certain other works in which "Divinest Watts" went astray on the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity. In Boston, where Cotton Mather read his views on the Trinity in 1727, he commented that Watts was a "very Disqualified person for the Managing of the Vast Subject he

[47] Ibid., p. 92.

[48] James P. R. Lyell, Mrs. Piozzi and Isaac Watts, London, 1934, p. 42. Mrs. Piozzi (p. 26) apostrophizes: "This is like Ajax's Prayer in the Iliad. Scarce inferior to Homer in poetical expression. O admirable Isaac Watts." Her comments on Watts cultivate the same rapturous vein which was apparent during the Bicentenary Commemoration in 1948.

[49] Anne S. Pratt, Isaac Watts and His Gifts of Books to Yale College, New Haven, 1938, p. 21.

[50] Ibid., p. 67. See also p. 25.

has undertaken; he is . . . too shallow for it . . . . Watts teaches First that there is no Eternal Son of God [51] . . . ." As long as Watts contented himself with treating conventional subjects in accepted fashion he drew unstinted encomiums of praise, but the ideas which were most personal, and it seems represented his own individual opinion, were hotly repulsed. Fortunately, of course, he generally accommodated himself to accepted viewpoints. Most of his eighteenth century contemporaries were content to ignore his essays on the Trinity and on the Glorified Humanity, and the records show that when, for instance, dangerous books of his came through chance into possession of such libraries as that in Yale College, the librarian carefully packed the offending volumes into corners inaccessible to students.[52] For the most part, then, his original ideas on Christ and the Trinity never reached a wide public. He became known as a writer of hymns and psalms, and the dangerous tracts were conveniently forgotten.

In The Glory of Christ as God-Man, Dr. Watts hazarded the opinion that "Michael is Jesus Christ, because he is called . . . the first of the princes, that is, the prime archangel." [53] He applies the scripture, "now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God and the power of his Christ," to the "power of Michael." [54] Watts "confirms this sentiment" that Christ and Michael are the same beings from Rev. xii. 7.[55] He continues, "Perhaps this Michael, that is Christ the King of the Jews, is the only archangel, or prince and head of all angels." [56] A little later he ventures the opinion that "Jesus Christ was that angel who generally appeared in ancient times to the patriarchs and to the Jews." [57] Watts seeks to confirm his opinion by extensive use

[51] Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections, 7th series, vol. VIII (Diary of Cotton Mather, 1709–1724), Boston, 1912, p. 816.

[52] A. S. Pratt, op. cit., p. 14.

[53] I. Watts, Discourses, Essays, and Tracts, on Various Subjects, vol. VI, London, 1753, p. 749.

[54] Ibid., p. 749.

[55] Ibid., p. 749. ("And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon. . . ." Since Christ is head of the host marching against Satan, Watts infers that Michael in this passage must mean Christ — such logic from the author of a text on Logic!)

[56] Ibid., p. 749. (Watts coyly hides this observation away in a footnote.)

[57] Ibid., p. 752.

of sentences from the Fathers. (He quotes Clement of Alexandria as author of the statement, "The Logos or Word was an angel"; and adds that Clement called the "Son of God the mystical angel.")

According to Watts, God constantly resided in this angel (Christ-Michael) and influenced this angel.[58] God has now given this archangel, or prince and head of all angels, dominion and power over all things. "This government of Christ is frequently represented as a gift and a reward, and therefore must belong eminently to the inferior nature (of Christ), which alone is capable of rewards and gifts from God." [59] It is because God has exalted Christ to be intercessor that Christ can particularly assist man, and not because Christ can himself "bestow effectual succour and relief." [60] In keeping with the spirit of his century, Watts proposes to give "a rational account how the man Jesus Christ may be vested with such extensive powers." [61] Christ, he declares, does not now know "every single thought, word, or action of every particular creature," but does know "all the greater, more general, and more considerable affairs and transactions of nations, churches, and particular persons." [62] Christ's human soul is "the brightest image or copy of the divine nature that is found among mere creatures." [63] Watts supposes that "it belongs only to the omniscience of God himself to take in with one infinite, simultaneous and extensive view all the shapes, sizes, situations and motions of every atom of the Universe," [64] and Christ who is "mere creature" does not share this prerogative. Christ, in the analogy of the author, is like a general watching a battle from an elevated position; he knows the way the battle is going, but "cannot know every sword that is drawn, nor hear every groan." [65] Not even the "glorious created mind of Christ" can share the infinite knowledge of God. At this point in his argument, Watts quotes John Locke's Essay concerning Human Understanding in support of his contention: Locke is quoted as saying that angels

[58] Ibid., p. 763.
[59] Ibid., p. 778.
[60] Ibid., p. 782.
[61] Ibid., p. 785.
[62] Ibid., p. 785.
[63] Ibid., p. 786.
[64] Ibid., p. 787.
[65] Ibid., p. 787.

may be able to " 'retain . . . as in one picture all their past knowledge at once.' " [66] Since angels may possess such extensive memories, Christ, the archangel, may possess even greater powers of retention. Watts, a little later in the argument, quotes Sir Isaac Newton in support of a subordinate point; [67] he is determined to leave no heavy artillery unmanned in shelling the fortifications of theological convention. Isaac Watts, the best remembered dissenting divine, the author of several of the greatest and best-beloved hymns in the English language, has set himself an interesting task as a theologian: he has set about demonstrating that "Christ before he came in the flesh," possessed a "nature inferior to God." [68]

Watts, who thought of Christ evidently as a glorified angel now exalted to the highest dominion in heaven, was once asked why he did not alter some passages in his early hymns in order more exactly to suit them to his matured theological views; his reply is worth quoting: "I freely answer I wish some things were corrected. But . . . I might tell you, that of all the books I have written, that particular copy is not mine. I sold it to Mr. Lawrence near thirty years ago, and his posterity make money of it to this day, and I can scarce claim a right to make any alteration in the book which would alter the sale of it." [69]

John Wesley, whose opinion of Watts' Divine Love poems has been given, threw out another penetrating view of Watts' theology: "Some years since," comments Wesley, "I read about fifty pages of Dr. Watts' ingenious treatise upon the 'Glorified Humanity of Christ.' But it so confounded my intellects, and plunged me into such unprofitable reasons, yea, dangerous ones, that I would not have read it through for five hundred pounds." And this is Wesley writing, who ranged freely up and down the course of theological literature from every century and country. But here, at last, we find him exclaiming against a book which he categorizes as so absolutely dangerous that not even for five hundred pounds can

[66] Ibid., p. 789. Locke was a favorite of Watts; in Horae Lyricae (1706) we find the lines (p. 118): Locke "hath a soul wide as the sea, calm as the night, bright as the day." Watts commented on Locke's "spacious mind," his "vast ideas."

[67] Ibid., p. 792.

[68] Ibid., p. 806.

[69] Louis F. Benson, The Early Editions of Doctor Watts' Hymns, Philadelphia, 1902, p. 15.

he consent to read it through! Wesley concludes with characteristic finality: "It led him [Watts] into Arianism. Take care that similar tracts (all of which I abhor) have not the same effect upon you." And here Wesley is writing not to some neophyte but to one of his most mature and trusted preachers! [70]

At the last, Watts, in one of his most passionate outbursts, found himself still absolutely baffled "and unsatisfied with respect to the God he was to worship." [71] In an unwonted paroxysm of despair he cries out, "Surely I ought to know the God whom I worship, whether he be one pure simple being or whether thou art a three-fold deity . . . ." At last he finds himself bewildered and beset with the scourge of temptation "to give up thy word and thy gospel as an unintelligible book, and betake myself to the light of nature and reason." He then prays, "I entreat, O most merciful Father, that thou wilt not suffer the remnant of my short life to be wasted in such endless wanderings, in quest of thee and thy Son Jesus, as a great part of my past days have been; . . . ." [72]

This was the end of the journey for Watts; at the end it was "De Profundis." There remains no record of a voice from the whirlwind; he had loved too much to choose and see his path. But because he did know how to choose and see his path through the dismal dark daze of organized prejudice against hymn-singing, he did work out a cunning and successful attack upon the old-fashioned psalm-singing of his age. He was a thinker, a poet, and his combination of learning and poesy has not been frequent enough in Christian history. His poetry merited the praise not only of eighteenth century critics such as Johnson,[73] but even the commendation of such perspicacious critics in this century as A. E. Housman (who once rated him above Pope, in a fine frenzy of excitement, no doubt) [74] and George Saintsbury, who did not rate him above Pope, but urbanely decided him to be still "really worth reading."

[70] John Wesley, The Works, New York, 1856, vol. VII, p. 82.

[71] I. Watts, The Works, London, 1753, vol. IV, p. 641.

[72] Ibid., p. 641.

[73] Dr. Johnson claimed no acquaintance with Watts' prose. "Of his life I know very little," he said on occasion. Southey was the first literary critic who gave any attention to Watts' theological opinions. See Johnson, Lives of the English Poets, Oxford, 1905, vol. III, p. 302.

[74] A. E. Housman, The Name and Nature of Poetry, Cambridge, 1933, p. 30.

Watts was praised during his bicentenary for qualifications he never possessed, but while greater figures have been forgotten, he at least knew how to inscroll his name imperishably in the memories of men. And now in a day when above all else Christian unity is desired, his hymns have become symbols of that oneness of spirit which must transcend every barrier.

KIERKEGAARD'S SECRET AFFLICTION

ARILD CHRISTENSEN
COPENHAGEN, DENMARK

THE following lines are intended to give an explanation of Kierkegaard's Thorn in the Flesh. They may be of interest not only to the biographer, but also to the student of Kierkegaard's terminology.[1] We shall consider contemporary interpretation and Kierkegaard's own interpretation of the term "the thorn in the flesh," review later scholarly theories, and finally present our own solution based upon a comparative study of passages from the Diaries, reminiscences of Kierkegaard preserved by his acquaintances, and extracts illustrating contemporary medical opinion.

I. The Thorn in the Flesh

The starting point of the investigation is the text of 2 Cor. 12, 7: "And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure."

The meaning given to this passage by a theological authority of the early nineteenth century is seen in the commentary on the New Testament by Olshausen, a book which belonged to Kierkegaard (cf. the sale catalogue of Kierkegaard's library, p. 4) and had probably claimed his attention when he studied theology, since the "Commentar über sämmtliche Schriften des Neuen Testaments" (Königsberg, 1830) was then recognized as the best book in its kind. Olshausen states: "Man kann nur sagen, es kann damit nicht bloss das allgemeine mit seiner Amtsthätigkeit

[1] Parts of this article appeared in the Danish literary periodical Orbis Litterarum, Tom. III, 1945, and I wish to thank the editor, Professor Billeskov Jansen, Copenhagen, who kindly permitted me to reprint some passages here. I also thank my friend Mr. Eric Jacobsen of Harvard University, who has read the paper and made valuable suggestions.

Abbreviations: E.D. (Edifying Discourses by S. Kierkegaard, translated by D. E. Swenson and L. M. Swenson, vol. IV). S.U.D. (The Sickness unto Death by S. Kierkegaard, translated by Walter Lowrie, Princeton, 1944). Saml.Skr. (The second edition of Kierkegaard's works in Danish, 1920–36). E.P. (The first edition of the Diaries in Danish, 1869–81). Pap. (The second, complete edition of the Diaries in Danish, 1909–48).

verbundene Leiden gemeint seyn . . . ebenso wenig darf man es in eine geistige Versuchung setzen. Es ist am wahrscheinlichsten, dass irgend ein schweres, niederbeugendes körperliches Leiden damit bezeichnet werden soll" (Op. cit., ad locum).

Kierkegaard's own dogmatical interpretation is to be found in the Edifying Discourses (E.D. pp. 49–73), where he defines the thorn in the flesh as a contrast between a spiritual blessing and some sort of affliction which is made only more excruciatingly painful by this contrast. It becomes a sign of the presence of the Spirit because it cannot be felt without the Spirit (pp. 60 sq.). Nothing, however, is said about the concrete nature of the phenomenon, this seeming to be of little importance to Kierkegaard: "We do not have very detailed information about the life of Paul, but, on the other hand, we do know Paul, and that is the important thing" (p. 65), we have spoken of the thorn in the flesh; we have attempted to explain the expression in general; it is in the general sense that what concerns a single man concerns all. We have not been particularly concerned what Paul may have especially intended by this expression; least of all have we wished to ask about it in the same way that someone might ask whether Paul was large or small of stature, beautiful of countenance, and other such irrelevancies." [2] "We do not particularly seek to indicate that which is perhaps accidental, perhaps insignificant, that which to the individual may be his thorn in the flesh" (pp. 72–73). Elsewhere also one receives the impression of something being avoided: "Perhaps such an experimenting self which in despair wills to be itself, at the moment when it is making a preliminary exploration of its concrete self, stumbles upon one or another hardship of the sort that the Christian would call a cross, a fundamental defect, it matters not what" (S.U.D., p. 112). Cf. The Aspect of My Authorship (Synspunktet for min Forfatter-Virksomhed, Saml. Skr. XIII, p. 612): "Providence had bound me in every way. I could not flee from it in the direction of aesthetic production, in the sense that I might finally have my own life in the category of the aesthetic. For even if religion had not been back of it all, that 'thorn in the flesh' would have prevented me all the same."

[2] The English translation should be corrected in this place: "— and other such matters."

In the Diaries the thorn in the flesh is so often mentioned that it becomes clear that the expression is a term with a fixed meaning, a term handled with the precision one may take for granted in Kierkegaard. He speaks of: "My thorn in the flesh, my limitation, my cross" (E.P., 1844–46, p. 432), he maintains that a spiritual blessing must necessarily be accompanied by a worldly curse (Pap. IV A 148). "Originally there were all the external conditions of enjoying life [Kierkegaard refers to his father's money], and in myself — that is only too certain — there was sufficient inclination to enjoy life, — but then there had been given me a thorn in the flesh, a cross; and so I could not properly enjoy life, — and thus I shall never enjoy life to the full" (E.P., 1833–43, p. 425). "It is a beautiful analogy of Lavater's, that even as Paul must have a thorn in the flesh, so Mary was wounded by a sword through the heart. The difference between the masculine and the feminine is so significant" (E.P., 1849, p. 536). But here also positive information is withheld, on purpose as it seems: "After my death — this is my consolation — no one will find in my papers a single intimation of what really made up my life, find that writing within me which explains everything and often transforms what the world would call trifles into events of tremendous importance to me, and which I deem a trifle when I remove the secret note that explains it" (Pap. IV A 85). Many passages in the Diaries have been erased and not a few pages torn out. One passage following a torn out page reads: ". . . certainly it had happened. But as for marriage it does not hold that everything is sold in the state in which it is found at the knock of the hammer, here some honesty is needed concerning one's past life. Here again my gallantry becomes apparent. Had I not honoured her, as my future wife, more than myself, had I not been more jealous of her honour than of my own, I would have remained silent, fulfilled her wish and married her — many a marriage conceals small affairs. I would not do that because she would have become my concubine; and then I would rather have murdered her. But if I were to have explained myself, I should have had to let her into horrible matters, my relations with my father, his despair, the eternal night brooding within me, my aberration, lust and debauches, which perhaps in the eyes of God are not so portentous

because it was fear that led me astray and where should I have taken refuge when I knew or suspected that the only man whose force and firmness I admired, wavered" (Pap. IV A 107). Kierkegaard here accuses himself of lechery — like St. Augustine — while he is conscious of exaggeration. That is to say, the debauches of which he speaks, are not to be regarded as the main affliction of his life. The underlying cause should be brought to light. That such a cause might be assumed is seen from the statement of Kierkegaard's friend and older contemporary, Professor Sibbern who when asked to communicate recollections of Kierkegaard, declared: "Concerning Kierkegaard's engagement I could tell what perhaps only very few know besides myself. But that which seems to me most important, I dare not entrust to paper" (E.P. 1833–43, p. LIII). Now of course Sibbern might allude only to the debauches, to the external aspect of Kierkegaard's cross, but on the other hand it is highly improbable that Kierkegaard would have deceived his friend regarding the true nature of his sufferings. He confided in Sibbern and recommended him to others as a spiritual guide.[3]

That Kierkegaard privately liked to believe Paul's affliction to have been of the same nature as his, can be seen from a passage, where he substitutes the Apostle's character for his own. In 1847 the Swedish authoress Emilie Carlén had made an attempt at novelizing the specific Kierkegaardian religiosity (her work was published serially in the Copenhagen newspaper Berlingske Tidende, nos. 43–206 of that year) and Kierkegaard recognized himself here (Pap. X i A 225). While speaking of this novel elsewhere (Pap. VIII i A 196), he says: "Suppose the following story. Paul the Apostle was really in love with the wife of a ship's captain. But Paul was an eccentric, he would not marry her although she was a widow. Now Nemesis comes to Paul, because Paul was an eccentric. One day he saw her pouring tea, and behold she was

[3] See E.P., 1833–43, p. LII, where the editor of the Diaries writes (1869): "Kierkegaard cherished a great love and veneration for Sibbern. A younger schoolfellow of Kierkegaard's . . . relates how once, while walking in a park, oppressed by melancholy thoughts, he came across Kierkegaard: Without mentioning the mood which tormented me, Kierkegaard suddenly walked up to me and, in a voice tremulous with sympathy, asked if I knew Professor Sibbern? Him I ought to visit, he was an entire man [en hel Mand], he was amiability's self and there was something soothing in his conversation."

with child — then grief awoke in Paul (that it was not by him that the widow was with child), and he despaired." This, then, he regarded as the *roman de sa vie* — and as an aspect of the Pauline "thorn."

A comparison between Kierkegaard's words in the Edifying Discourses and in the Diaries indicate a close connection between if not identity of, the thorn in the flesh and the contents of "the secret note that explains everything."

II. Scholarly Theories

The attempts to inquire into this secret are numerous and show very divergent results. The following is a brief examination of the most important of them.

In Lange-Eichbaum, Genie, Irrsinn und Ruhm (München, 1928) the author pronounces: "Kierkegaard: Unzweifelhaft homosexuell." This assertion is satisfactorily refuted by Helweg (Søren Kierkegaard, Copenhagen, 1933, p. 310). There are no signs whatsoever of repressed homosexuality in the Diaries or anywhere in the works.

According to Vesser (Frömmigkeit als Leidenschaft, Leipzig, 1928, p. 40) Kierkegaard died from general paralysis. This is disproved by Helweg (op. cit., pp. 315–16) by a medical account of the last illness.

To Hirsch (Kierkegaard-Studien, I–II, Gütersloh 1930) the thorn in the flesh is a blasphemy pronounced by Kierkegaard in the spring of 1836. This explanation leaves it unintelligible how the cross — as will be seen later — could be represented as "a disproportion between body and soul."

Geismar (Søren Kierkegaard, I–VI, Copenhagen, 1926–28, see I, p. 66) regards the thorn as identical with the phenomenon by Kierkegaard styled The Earthquake (in all likelihood the discovery in 1835 of his father's religious guilt, cf. Helweg, p. 61), anyhow something psychical. This cannot be correct, because Kierkegaard consulted a physician in this matter (E.P., 1844–46, p. 432, where he refers to a disproportion between body and soul). Geismar also advances the possibility of a corporeal sin (masturbation) constituting the object of and developing that consciousness of guilt to which so many allusions are made (Geismar, p. 48, The recollection of a Vita ante acta). However plausible this assumption, this could not be the only sin in Kierkegaard's life, since he touches upon an occurrence during his early years which might be betrayed by others and bring disaster on his own social existence.

There are several notes with the title, De occultis non judicat ecclesia. (See E.P., 1844–46, pp. 168–69, 334, 339 and compare pp. 159 and 335: "Today a reminder walked past me, accusing me. What if the accusation broke forth now! I could go away, far away, live in a foreign country . . .")

Helweg gives a quite different interpretation. In his capacity as a psychiatrist he ferrets out all symptoms of manic-depressive insanity, especially Kierkegaard's instability of temper and sudden whims, alternate periods of feverish activity and of literary sterility. He concludes that an unconquerable melancholy formed the thorn in the flesh. Such an assumption is impossible: Kierkegaard would never have recognized insanity in himself — a disease of the spirit, a negation of spiritual freedom — thereby discarding his own philosophical productions as the offspring of an unsound mind. We only find expressions as "melancholy bordering on insanity" and the like (P.A. Heiberg, En Episode i Sören Kierkegaard's Ungdomsliv, An Episode in Sören Kierkegaard's Youth, Copenhagen 1912, p. 14). Heiberg quotes a passage from the Diaries: ". . . the unhappy melancholy which indeed in one respect has been a sort of partial insanity." This would rather suggest a single irresistible delusion or fixed idea than a universal depression.[4] The same appears from Pap. IV A 148: "Nullum exstitit magnum ingenium sine aliqva dementia, this is the secular version of the religious thesis: whom God blesses in a religious sense, He eo ipso curses in a worldly sense." Now Kierkegaard could not possibly believe that he was blessed spiritually if his spirit had been darkened and its powers impaired by insanity. Kierkegaard took no interest in *psychiatry*, and none of the books of the noted psychiatrists of those days are to be found in his library. In one passage he expressly gives vent to his contempt of this kind of medical men (The Concept of Irony, Saml. Skr. XIII, p. 261: "Lately there has been much ado about this demon and as I see from a work by Heinsius [a classical scholar] Lelut, a lunatic's doctor in Paris, has had the arrogance to assert: que Socrate était affecté de la folie, qu'en langage technique on appelle hallucination"). And if Kierkegaard had shown signs of insanity he would not have been taken into treatment by Prof. Oluf Lundt Bang, the physician whom we know that he consulted.[5] In

[4] Helweg expressly affirms (op. cit., p. 223), "He asked [Bang] if he could get rid of his depression"; there are no cogent reasons to believe this.

[5] See E.P., 1848, p. 53, note by the editor, H. Gottsched; in his later years, Kierkegaard consulted another doctor, Seligmann Meyer Trier (see P. A. Heiberg, S.K. i Barndom og Ungdom, Copenhagen, 1895, p. 38), who, however, was solely concerned with the perfectioning of the art of diagnosis and with the treatment of internal diseases (cf. 'Biographisk Leksikon' s.v. Trier); there is no reason to doubt the correctness of Gottsched's statement.

his Handbook of Therapy (Haandbog i Therapien, Copenhagen, 1852) Prof. Bang omits "the mental ills the cure of which require treatment in specially equipped institutions and by a physician who has devoted himself wholly to this discipline" (p. IV). In short, it would seem that Helweg considered the whole question from the point of view of the modern psychiatrist, whose mind has been cleared from all theological and philosophical inhibitions, and who is apt to forget that Kierkegaard might perfectly well speak of "unconquerable melancholy" and "partial insanity" without ever desiring to seek medical aid.

Rikard Magnussen (Det saerlige Kors — The Particular Cross — Copenhagen, 1943) considers the thorn in the flesh to have been gibbousness. This is not sufficiently established in Magnussen's book and it seems that definitive evidence can only be obtained by inspecting the mortal remains of Kierkegaard. Such an inspection has not yet taken place. Anyhow, if Kierkegaard had been hunchbacked, how could he have written the following disavowal of a merely bodily affliction (Pap. IV A 154): "A Disposition: A genius endowed with every possible gift, with power to master the whole of existence and make men obey him, discovers in his consciousness a small fixed point, a small insanity. Thereby he is so exasperated that he decides to kill himself; because this small point is all to him, it makes him a serving spirit, a human being. Furthermore this small point is not something merely external (such as being lame of one leg, one-eyed, ugly or the like; this would not trouble him) but it has a spiritual aspect and one might think it could be eliminated through an exertion of the will; therefore it provokes him."

Anders Gemmer (in Gemmer und Messer, Sören Kierkegaard und Karl Barth, Stuttgart, 1925, p. 31) depends upon the death bed utterance: "I had my thorn in the flesh as Paul had his; that was why I could not submit to ordinary conditions, so I concluded my task was an extraordinary one . . . It was the same that was wrong with R. [Kierkegaard's fiancée, Regine Olsen]: I thought it could have been changed, but it could not, so I broke off the engagement." (E.P., 1854–55, p. 593.) He comments on it in this manner: "Mit dieser Äusserung stimmt überein dass (wie wir wissen) Kierkegaard sich einmal während der Verlobungszeit in dieser Angelegenheit an einen Arzt gewendet hat, um bei ihm Rat und Aufklärung zu suchen. Es liegt unter solchen Verhältnissen natürlich nahe, bei dem 'Pfahl im Fleisch' an irgendeine geschlechtliche Krankheit oder Unvollkommenheit zu denken, die dann wiederum entweder geerbt oder mit seiner 'Jugendsünde' in irgendeinem Zusammenhang stehen könnte." Gemmer, giving no further argument, leaves the question open. One of the possibilities mentioned, however,

may be excluded: Kierkegaard did not suffer from a venereal disease. As Helweg points out, the physician dissuaded Kierkegaard from his intention of using will-power to master the illness (Helweg, op. cit., and E.P., 1844–46, p. 432).

III. The Disproportion between Soul and Body

In spite of this multitude of interpretations and conjectures, the elucidation of what Kierkegaard meant by a "disproportion between soul and body," seems in no way to have been advanced. The passages in the Diaries dealing with this matter have hardly been commented upon. Kierkegaard writes: "Delicate, slender and weak, in almost every respect without the qualifications for being considered a full man, when compared to others; melancholy, sick of soul, in many ways deeply and finally disabled: [yet] one thing was given me: an eminent intelligence, probably that I might not be quite defenceless" (E.P., 1833–43, p. 424). Such a contrast is stressed in Pap. VII i A 126: "I am an essentially unhappy individual who from my earliest time have been nailed to some affliction bordering on insanity, which must have its deeper cause in a disproportion between my soul and my body — because, and that is my infinite consolation, it has no relation to my spirit, which, perhaps through the tension of soul and body, has acquired an exceptional elasticity." Then follow some purposely vague sentences about his father's melancholy and the great mistake he made when he became engaged to Regine Olsen. Kierkegaard continues: "Though not fond of confidants, though absolutely averse to speaking to others about my innermost, I all the same hold and have held that it is a man's duty not to pass over that judicial instance which lies in consulting another human being; only this should not become frivolous confidence, but serious and official communication. Therefore I have asked my physician if he believed that the disproportion in my constitution between the bodily and the psychical could be eliminated in order that I might realize the universal.[6] He

[6] 'Realisere det Almene': achieve the ordinary, normal in human life. Usually understood by students of K. as the consummation of a marriage, an interpretation justified by the context; Kierkegaard also constantly uses the term in this sense in the closing pages of the chapter of "Either–Or" called "The Balance between the Aesthetic and the Ethical Element in the Formation of Personality."

doubted; I have asked him if he believed that spirit through will power could recast or transform such a fundamental disproportion; he doubted; he would not even advise me to apply my whole will power, of which he has an idea, I might blast everything. From that moment I have made up my mind . . ." (The date of this consultation cannot be ascertained; Helweg refers it to the year 1846, the time when the note was written; Geismar and Gemmer to the period of the engagement (1840), a fairly well grounded assumption since the context, immediately before, deals with the engagement. It appears, however, that Kierkegaard consulted his physician about this matter more than once, see E.P., 1844, p. 55: "It consoles me that I have spoken to my physician. I often used to fear that I might be too proud to speak to anyone. But as I have done it before, I have done it now again. And what can the physician tell me? Nothing. But to me it is important that I have respected the human instance." Cf. Pap. VIII i A 185. Perhaps Kierkegaard saw his physician regularly, in which case it would be difficult to date a single consultation with the aid of the undated notes of the Diaries.)

It must now be shown what Kierkegaard as a theologian or a philosopher can have meant by the terms "soul" and "spirit." In 1825 the above mentioned Olshausen had renewed a conception of human nature which was new to the evangelical Church. From his book "De naturae humanae trichotomia Novi Testamenti scriptoribus recepta" there ensued a controversy, lasting all Kierkegaard's lifetime. His interest in it is revealed by the frequent occurrence in the works of the terms "psychic" and "pneumatic." Kierkegaard seems to have sided with the trichotomists according to whom the soul is an instrument of the spirit as the body is an instrument of the soul. In the spirit there is a higher rationality and a will. The soul is charged with the vitality of the subject and produces actions through unfree decisions; it is linked with emotions and impulses. As we have seen, Kierkegaard thought both his body and his soul were suffering, only his spirit being intact. We shall first take up the bodily component.

Kierkegaard's niece, Henriette Lund (a daughter of his sister Petrea) relating memories of her childhood (E.P., 1854–55, p. 601) tells about an accident that her uncle suffered during his

boyhood. She writes: ". . . by falling from a tree he received such a blow that at least he personally attached importance to it for his whole state of health later on — and thereby indeed for his whole life — perhaps as the first link in that chain of sufferings that was to lead him along his lonely ways." (This accident took place at the earliest in 1828 — see Magnussen, op. cit., pp. 148–50 — when Kierkegaard was a boy of fifteen.) She continues the narrative: "My mother, recently married, was present and had to take leave of the pale, suffering boy, whose tears were rolling slowly but ceaselessly like an inexhaustible flow. She pressed a small purse with money into his hand to assuage his wound. Immediate and active medical help had been more appropriate. But no one thought of that at the time." [7]

Now when Kierkegaard talked to his physician about this, what information can we expect he obtained? Probably the same that is to be found in the Handbook of Therapy, mentioned above. Oluf Lundt Bang says of paralysis in general — the word "paralysis" is the heading of the hospital journal of the illness that ended Kierkegaard's life —: "Paralysis may result directly from colds, draughts and constant freezing, external violence, wounds, pressure . . ." (p. 65). "The illness becomes incurable without danger to or shortening of life when it is not located in an organ essential to maintenance of life" (p. 66). Affections of the spine are said to be caused by "external violence, blows, knocks, falls" (p. 273) and they "involve lameness of different parts according to the region of the spine that has been affected . . . in some cases impotency during a long period before any of the other symptoms show" (p. 273). Bang would have made his patient realize that the fall from the tree had impaired his sexual functions.

If, then, Kierkegaard admitted to impotency or symptoms of what he believed to be impotency, Bang would endeavour to find other, accessory sources of this defect, and he would prepare to make the diagnosis of spermatorrhoea.

This was a favourite diagnosis in those days. All medical text books and a great number of monographs treat the pathological complex of autoeroticism, spermatorrhoea and impotency, the one producing the

[7] Henriette Lund, Erindringer fra Hjemmet, Copenhagen, 1909, pp. 82–83.

other and all three phenomena terminating in very disastrous maladies.[8]

What Kierkegaard knew of these medical opinions can be gathered from the books he owned. In a passage of the works he claims to be the owner of some volumes of the French Encyclopedia (Saml. Skr. XIII, p. 436), but this is probably a literary fiction as the Encyclopedia does not figure in the sales catalogue. (Therefore no use can safely be made of Didérot's article, Manstupration, which clearly gives the contemporary views.) However, he possessed some volumes of Ersch and Gruber's Allgemeine Encyclopädie, and in one of these (III. Section, 3. Theil, 1832) is the article "Onanie."

These articles must have terrified Kierkegaard and he was confirmed in his fears by another of his books: Praxis Medica (Copenhagen, 1818, see p. 510 sq.) by Frederik Ludvig Bang, the father of Oluf Lundt Bang, which deals with the topics.

Kierkegaard might apply some of this to himself: The "nervorum nimia agilitas," of course, but also in some degree the "ideae libidinosae": We know from his secretary, Israel Levin, that Kierkegaard did not avoid audacity of speech and thought. The manuscript reminiscences are quoted by P. A. Heiberg (in a study of Kierkegaard's childhood and adolescence — Sören Kierkegaard i Barndom og Ungdom, Copenhagen, 1895, p. 65): "We spoke of [Hans] Andersen one evening in Frederiksberg garden: Andersen has no idea of what fairy tales are, . . . he has a kind heart, that is enough . . . that is very innocent. But fairy tales — and now in a moment he conjured up six or seven tales, to make me feel almost creepy — his imagination was so vivid that it was as if he saw the images before his very eyes — he seemed to live in a world of spirits and with a strange impropriety and eccentricity he would develop the most terrible things with a graphic power which was dreadful — thus he described a Greek committing a homosexual act in the Attic nights and by way of contrast a hermit in a forest, beset by temptations — all with a minuteness that was indecent and demonic — it was his opinion as to his narration that only the obscene thoughts, not the daring expressions should be avoided. — Poetry is not for sucklings or half grown girls,

[8] A few titles may serve as examples: Kleemann, De morbosa seminis excretione, Monachii, 1831; Thomas, De spermatorrhoea, Vratislaviae, 1839; Kollreuter, Studien über die Spermatorrhoe, Tübingen, 1842; Richard Dawson, An Essay on Spermatorrhoea, London, about 1840.

but for mature persons — that was his opinion — in Gilleleje where he was called the crazy student, he had bewildered and terrified the maids by the way he looked at them when they came into his room — desire burned in his soul although his body was tranquil."

In some passages the Diaries give one the same impression of Kierkegaard, for example he frankly quotes Ovid (Pap. III B 44):

> "Quos humeros, quales vidi tetigique lacertos!
> Forma papillarum quam fuit apta premi!
> Quam castigato planus sub pectore venter!
> Quantum et quale latus! Quam juvenile femur!
> Somewhere in Ovid." [Amores I,5,19 sq.]

Why should not Kierkegaard have made a note of where these verses were to be found? He usually does not shrink from being meticulous but adds page, paragraph or volume to every quotation. Perhaps he had learned the passage by heart and put it on paper later, when he had forgotten where it belonged. That Kierkegaard was preoccupied with the problem of "ideae libidinosae," is evident in passages like the following: "There is a particular kind of temptation, when a human being in the strictest sense sins against his will, haunted by the dread of sin; when, for instance, there are sinful thoughts which he ardently desires to flee from, does everything to escape, but which still force themselves upon him . . ." (Pap. IX, A, 331–334).

Oluf Lundt Bang would be liable to relate his patient's alleged impotency to the spinal affection. The accident could have produced impotency, but this defect might also have arisen from juvenile masturbation. O. L. Bang says (op. cit., p. 411) that impotency will accompany spermatorrhoea, whereby the sexual act is rendered impossible "in spite of desire and an occasion to gratify it." As for the seriousness of the disease Bang might confirm Kierkegaard's apprehensions, at least he would not treat them lightly: "In some individuals vigour remains, in others it wanes rapidly, finally convulsions and lameness especially of the legs [follow]" (p. 411).[9] — In these cases Bang prescribed a seda-

[9] Kierkegaard is known to have fallen in the street because his legs failed him (Heiberg, op. cit., p. 46).

tive, infusum Valerianae (Handbook of Therapy, pp. 413–14) — and the hospital journal mentions that Kierkegaard had been taking this drug daily.[10] This shows that the malady, in Bang's opinion, could last a lifetime: "Sometimes nature only requires that the vices which were the cause should be desisted from; if this can happen, health will be regained of itself or through the exact observance of dietetic measures; but often this is not sufficient; even many years after the patient has had strength to conquer the temptations, the disorders remain and all somatic and psychic remedies are often in vain applied to them" (p. 412).

Now it must be kept in mind that Kierkegaard's affliction was not purely somatic but consisted in a disproportion of soul and body, furthermore that Kierkegaard speaks of his soul as a trichotomist: the soul includes the human instincts. If then Levin was right in maintaining that "desire burned in his soul although his body was tranquil," the disproportion between body and soul is a disproportion between unimpaired instincts and a body unable to give them effect.

As we have seen, Kierkegaard contemplated the use of will power against his psychosomatic infirmity, that is to say, he would have resorted to the spirit. He also seems to have drawn the spirit into the whole question (E.P., 1850, p. 299): "On shame as regards sexuality. . . . The procreators only represent the lower side, being determined at the moment of procreation by their lower nature or by the sphere of the synthesis most distant from spirit. But this very departure from spirit is shame; spirit is shame, or man's determination as spirit is shame. The beast has no shame and neither has the bestial human; and the less spirit the less shame." Kierkegaard himself had experienced shame, he even on his death bed attributed extreme importance to it. The hospital journal says (Heiberg, op. cit., pp. 42–43): "It should be noticed that he formerly has had difficulties in making water, but only when he thought that he was, or might be observed during urination. When alone, he made water without difficulty . . . . Today he was obliged to make water frequently, perhaps because of the previously mentioned aversion against doing so in the

[10] The record of this has not been included by Heiberg in the printed extract of the hospital journal.

presence of others (the night nurse) and he almost constantly thinks about this. He even believes that this defect has influenced his life decisively and made him an eccentric." From such an affirmation one may deduce what Kierkegaard can have meant by the "small fixed point," "the small insanity" (Pap. IV A 154), "the worldly curse" (IV A 148). The following passages from the Diaries make it seem probable that the "spiritual blessing" had been accompanied by what is nowadays termed "psychical impotence": "I know not of fear of external resistance but there is an inner resistance when God lets me feel the thorn that rankles — this is my suffering" (E.P., 1844–46, p. 433). "But had I not been externally favoured I would have had to try if the reparation [Reparationen] would succeed. Perhaps it would have succeeded just because I was under compulsion. But being free and of opinion — like my physician — that it is highly dubious how the reparation will pass off (and it is dubious just because I was not compelled) I have made the right choice. Necessity is the only help in such cases because infinity is too great a power to be alone applied to such" (Pap. VIII i A 185). "In order to be truly exceptional he must be unfree himself, forced into it. Here lies the significance of his dementia. There is a fixed point in which he suffers; he cannot join the herd. That is his suffering. This dementia perhaps has nothing to do with what is his true genius, but it is the pain by which he personally is tormented into isolation" (E.P., 1850, p. 298). "I knew of my life that if others knew its secret, I would, from my earliest times be an object of pity and commiseration, a burden to myself: such a life God cares for" (E.P., 1848, p. 61). "What I lack, is the animal function in its relation to fulfilling a human existence. They take their bestial joy in demanding from me what has been denied me and scorn what has been given me. . . . Give me a body, or if you had given it to me when I was twenty I had not become so" (E.P., 1850, p. 185).

As stated above Oluf Lundt Bang did not treat mental ills, but he does claim to treat hypochondria (Handbook of Therapy, pp. 60–64). "It is important exactly to examine the causes and the patient's previous state of health and the physician should remember to question the patient about all functions, especially the

sexual because often he is ashamed of avowing the supposed impotency, when not invited to do so." While Kierkegaard spoke of his "small insanity" and "worldly curse," Bang — the aging man whose naïveté is conspicuous in his poems and the versified memoirs he left behind at his death — might have been amazed but he would conceal his amazement and give Kierkegaard a patient hearing. In the first place because he recognized "the many nervous complaints which arise in connection with spermatorrhoea and often disguise the disease" (p. 410). Secondly, because he believed: "The physician of the hypochondriac should acquire the patient's confidence by admitting the reality of the disease, an admission he may make with a good conscience, there being always something unsound at the root of the complaints; by making this admission and giving the desired, reassuring explanation of the patient's state the physician has often made a good beginning of the cure" (pp. 62–63).

Kierkegaard may have experienced signs of impotency during the period of debauches which Heiberg deals with, collecting the evidence for a "slip" of some sort, perhaps a visit to a brothel in a state of intoxication (En Episode, pp. 16 sq.). Some passages in the Diaries hint at such a period, e.g., E.P., 1848, p. 61: "My early life began without spontaneity, with a terrible melancholy, it was disturbed already in my earliest childhood at its deepest foundations, a melancholy which for a time plunged me into sin and debauches, although from the human point of view I was rather demented than guilty."

Words such as these, telling of melancholy without mention of the psychosomatic affliction, have induced some biographers to distinguish the thorn in the flesh from "the night within." It should be remembered, however, that Kierkegaard speaks of both the thorn and melancholy as the "fundamental defect" (see the passages quoted from E.P., 1848, p. 61. Pap. VII i A 126. E.D. p. 73). He thereby considers the same matter under different aspects, including "the small fixed point" in his general disposition. When connecting the disproportion between soul and body with the "unconquerable melancholy" the simple fact should always be remembered that as long as we accept Henriette Lund's statement of a definite bodily injury as a determining factor in

Kierkegaard's life, the psychosomatic defect must remain the primary phenomenon.

A disposition to gloom existed in Kierkegaard long before the disproportion between soul and body had come to his notice. He often mentions his joyless childhood, e.g., Pap. VIII i A 205: "From my earliest childhood an arrow of grief has been fixed in my heart. As long as it remains there, I am an ironist — pull it out, and I die." Separated from their context in the Diaries such passages lead to the assumption of melancholy as an isolated phenomenon, unconnected with states of the body. But this cannot be true, because often in the most surprising places the bodily aspect is repeatedly taken into consideration. A note very close in time to the one just quoted is an example of this: "In a certain sense my whole misfortune is rooted in this: Had I not had money, I should never have been able to save the dreadful secret of my melancholy." [He then speaks of his father's guilt, and concludes:] "What I really lack, is a body and bodily qualifications" (Pap. VIII i A 177).

The bodily aspect of his melancholy, then, cannot possibly be disregarded. Thereupon the question arises, Can a disproportion between psyche and soma, between instinct and body produce melancholy? Certainly, especially when such a defect is believed to affect one's social position and essential relations with other human beings . On the other hand, Can such a disproportion arise from melancholy? In our own time medical authorities would answer in the affirmative, but in Kierkegaard's day the notion of "psychical impotence" had not yet become known. Bang writes (cf. ante) that hypochondriacs really suffer from some bodily infirmity, and he must have been eager to find a bodily cause of Kierkegaard's condition, as a depressive state of mind would neither by him nor his patient be regarded as the ultimate source of the malady.

Postscript.

After the completion of this article a book of importance to our subject has appeared (Aa. Kabell, Kierkegaardstudiet i Norden — The Study of Kierkegaard in Scandinavia-Copenhagen, 1948). Kabell (op. cit., pp. 273 sq.) quotes a pseudonymous poem of nearly

a hundred pages by O. L. Bang, published in 1848. The poem, a mock heroic ballad, dull and verbose, in a few of its verses seems to hint at Kierkegaard's engagement: A knight wants to abandon his lady, but is unable to make a decision; he talks vaguely to her about his secret sins and despair, then takes his leave with the intention of going to the wars: "Away from hence! That victory be mine in other battles. This one is too hard."

The discovery made by Kabell is in perfect harmony with my thesis. The poem speaks of secret sins and also alludes to some shortcoming in the knight.

We know from a short biography by a friend (Dr. Carl Otto), that Bang was rather notorious for frankness of speech, good natured, but thoughtless. This might help to explain his almost unbelievable indiscretion towards Kierkegaard.

As stated above (p. 260, note 5) Kierkegaard's physician at the time of his death was Seligmann Meyer Trier. It is possible that he had broken off relations with Bang, and that he had done so as a result of the poem. To fix the time when this rupture may have taken place, should be the object of further investigations.

P.P.S. July 1949. The Royal Library of Copenhagen has three letters (not yet published) from Bang to K. dating from the years 1849–1851. They are very friendly and confidential and show no signs that an estrangement should previously have occurred; on the contrary, in 1850, Bang exchanges the formal address "De" with the familiar "Du."

"ONE HUNDRED FIFTY-THREE LARGE FISH" (JOHN 21:11)

The theory that this number reflects the number of kinds of fish recognized in antiquity comes from Jerome, Comm. xiv in Ezechiel (Migne, PL 25, 474C). He says, "Writers on the nature and properties of animals, who have learned 'fishing' in either Latin or Greek (one of whom is the most learned poet Oppianus Cilix), say there are one hundred fifty-three species of fish." It was customary in antiquity — and the practice has not come to an end — to generalize from single instances, and we shall not be far from the mark if we suspect that Jerome's only source for this statement is his understanding of Oppian. Jerome knew the work of Pliny on natural history, and Pliny (N. H. ix. 43) states that there are seventy-four species of fish, in addition to thirty varieties of crustacea.

But does Oppian say that there are one hundred fifty-three? In actual fact, Oppian states (Hal. i. 80–92) that there are countless myriads of species of fish, although "we must make our calculations with human minds" since only the gods know certainly how many there are. To make such a calculation is fairly difficult, since A. W. Mair's "classified zoological catalogue" in the Loeb Library edition of Oppian (fishes, etc., pp. 519–21) is not quite complete, and in any event one cannot be sure how Jerome or his source counted when Oppian lists genera instead of species. As far as I have been able to tell, without counting genera and duplications, Oppian lists 123 fish (if we include 3 whales and 1 dolphin), 17 molluscs, 7 crustacea, 2 echinoderms, 2 named vermin plus the unnamed leech, as well as the water-newt, turtle, beaver, seal and sponge. This adds up to 157. Perhaps the whales and dolphin should be dropped to make 153, but this seems unnecessary favoritism either to the vermin or the water-newt and his companions.

The point in question is very simple. No one who did not have the number 153 already in mind could approach Oppian's work and count the species of fish, especially since Oppian himself declares them uncountable and does not list them in any systematic way. Moreover, Oppian's work was probably written between 176 and 180 A.D. Thus to explain the Fourth Gospel by means of it is impossible. What Jerome or some earlier Christian discovered was due to coincidence, and incomplete coincidence at that.[1]

[1] Note that according to John 21:13 the fish were presumably edible. Thus many of the species listed in writers on fish are excluded. Josephus (Bell. iii. 508)

How then shall we explain the number of the fish? We may recall that Jerome discusses this passage in commenting on Ezekiel 47:10, where the "fishers" (as in Jeremiah 16:16 and Mark 1:17) spread their nets for "fish after their kinds, as the fish of the great sea, exceeding many" (as in Matt. 13:47). Now in the Septuagint, which John seems to have followed, the expression "after their kinds" drops out, and we have seen reason to believe that John lays no emphasis on it. What he does emphasize is the Septuagint expression, "an exceedingly great number." How can such an exceedingly great number be represented?

F. H. Colson had an interesting article in the Journal of Theological Studies 16 (1914–15), pp. 67–76, on "Triangular Numbers in the New Testament." In it he discussed the mystical and mysterious significance of these numbers, and pointed out a good number of them in the New Testament, especially in the Johannine writings. For 153 he takes up the interpretation of Augustine (Tract. in Ioh. 122, ed. Bén. iii, 813–14), who observes that this number is the sum of the numbers from one to seventeen. Augustine claims that ten means the decalogue while seven refers to the sevenfold Spirit of God (Rev. 3:1, I Cor. 12:11 — seven workings of the Spirit, verses 9–10). This claim is not very convincing.

We may suggest alternatively that in the first place we know that the evangelist was interested in computation, for he gives us the numbers of the first (John 2:11) and second (John 4:54) signs of Jesus, presumably in the belief that the reader will continue to count and reach seven for the raising of Lazarus. There are seven disciples present when the 153 fish are caught (John 21:2), while ten disciples received the Holy Spirit (John 20:24). In the second place, in the rabbinic treatise Pirke Aboth (5:1–11) the importance of ten and seven are stressed. In Pirke Aboth 5:5 the ten miracles wrought in Egypt are mentioned; in the book of Exodus these are called "signs," the same word used of the seven "signs" of Jesus in John 1–11. Moreover Philo insists on the importance of ten as the sum of the numbers from one to four (De decalogo 26) and on the importance of seven and ten together (De opificio mundi 99). It seems probable, then, that the significance of seventeen is due to its being the sum of the two most sacred numbers, and that this significance is multiplied when the number is triangulated.

---

tells us that in the lake of Gennesaret the species of fish were different as to taste and appearance from those found elsewhere. He gives no clues as to how many there were.

In the gospel, however, the emphasis does not fall on the components of the number but on its size. "Even though there were so many, the net was not torn" (John 21:11). The number must stand for the perfect unity of the church, into which the fish are gathered by the disciples. Like its components it is a sacred number; it stands for the number of the elect (cf. John 17:6), as does the number 144,000 (Rev. 7:4) plus an innumerable multitude (Rev. 7:9) in the Apocalypse.

Therefore the significance of the number 153 is not to be found in any collection of species of fish but rather in the symbolic value of its components, and in the total reached by triangulating their sum.

Robert M. Grant

University of the South
Sewanee, Tennessee

A NOTE ON EDSON'S MACEDONICA III [1]

In a significant study of inscriptions pertaining to the cults of Thessalonica, Charles Edson has given for the first time a text both accurate and complete of the "testament of a Thessalonian priestess." [2] The portion of the text with which we are immediately concerned, is brief and easily summarized. A priestess of Dionysos Prinophoros bequeaths to her thiasos two plethra of vineyard, ὅπως ἀποκέηταί (= ἀποκαίηται) μοι ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς μὴ ἔλατ⟨τ⟩ον (δηνάρια) ε, "in order that sacrifices may be burned for me from the income thereof to the value of not less than five denarii." [3] Each member of the thiasos is to bring a crown of roses to the ceremony; if he fails to do so, he shall forfeit his share of the legacy.[4]

Edson rightly follows Picard and Avezou in equating ἀποκέηται with ἀποκαίηται; [5] and combining this with the contribution of rose garlands required of the mystai, he arrives, again in accord with Picard and Avezou, at the conclusion that "the objects to be burned in the commemoratory sacrifice are not here mentioned, but from lines 19–20 [6] it appears that they were crowns made from the roses for which Macedonia was famous." [7] Picard and Avezou believed that they had detected the existence of a rite, widely spread through Asia Minor and Macedonia, of burning roses at the graves of the dead. Their discovery rested on the stipulation παρακαύσουσιν ῥόδοις in two testaments from Philippi. In the one, it takes the form παρακαύσουσίν μοι ῥόδοις κα[τ' ἔτος; in the other, παρακαύσουσιν δὲ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους ῥόδοις. From these texts Picard and Avezou reconstructed the burnt sacrifice of roses; but they failed to see the exact correspondence of the phrases to παρακαύσωσίν

[1] Edson, HTR 41, 1948, 153 ff.

[2] 167 f.

[3] Thus Edson, 170. The epithet Prinophoros and its connection with Dionysos are fully explained in Edson's commentary

[4] A verb is lacking on the stone, and Edson supplies ⟨φερέτωσαν δὲ⟩ καὶ οἱ μύστε (= μύσται). After μύστε comes μικρὸς μέγας, and Edson (169 f.), contrary to Perdrizet and Baege, doubts that this phrase "is necessarily much more than a forceful expression for 'all'." That the phrase is to be taken literally, is suggested by a comparison with Pliny, Epist. 10.96, on the Christian conventicles (omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus) and Livy 39.8, on the Bacchanals (mixti feminis mares, aetatis tenerae maioribus). These passages are conveniently displayed for another purpose by Grant, HTR 41, 1948, 274.

[5] BCH 38, 1914, 38–62, esp. 47.

[6] στέφανον ῥόδινον.

[7] Edson, 169.

μοι παρενταλίοις, which occurs in the third inscription cited by them.[8] Perdrizet had previously used these inscriptions to illustrate the Rosalia at Philippi with no hint that the roses were to be burned,[9] and subsequently Collart, recognizing the syntactical identity of ῥόδοις and παρενταλίοις, saw that the sacrifice was to be carried out in the one instance on the Παρεντάλια = Parentalia, the festival in honor of deceased relations, in the other on the Ῥόδα = Rosae or Rosalia, the rose festival which took place in the spring of the year.[10] Collart decisively reduced the supposed rite of the burning of roses at the tombs to a grammatical misunderstanding,[11] and so returned to the simpler view implied by Perdrizet.[12]

Nevertheless, Picard and Avezou made a signal contribution to a correct interpretation of the testament of the Thessalonicean priestess when they recognized ἀποκέηται = ἀποκαίηται. While a meaning can be obtained by leaving ἀποκέηται unchanged, since in this form it is the subjunctive of ἀπόκειμαι,[13] the parallels adduced by Picard and Avezou are convincing, especially a testament from Phrygian Hierapolis which uses the phrase εἰς ἀποκαυσμόν.[14] Accordingly, the priestess of Thessalonica stipulates that a burnt sacrifice of some kind [15] is to be made to her, probably each year on the Rosalia, and each member of the thiasos is obligated to bring a rose garland to crown the altar and adorn the grave.[16] With this double ceremony of sacrifice and rhodismos, the double ceremony which is prescribed by another Macedonian inscription cited by Edson is now even more pertinent: "every year at a stated festival a bowl is to be filled with wine before the testator's grave and the grave itself be crowned." [17]

Herbert C. Youtie

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor

[8] BCH 38, 1914, 48. The inscriptions are also cited by Collart, BCH 55, 1931, 59; id., Philippes, Éc. fr. d'Athènes, Trav. et Mém., V, Paris, 1937, 475.

[9] BCH 24, 1900, 305 f., 320 f. Nilsson's article (1914) on Rosalia in Pauly-Wissowa also raises no problem.

[10] For terminology of the rose festival see Nilsson, ibid.; for general bibliography, Hoey, HTR 30, 1937, 22.

[11] Collart, BCH 55, 1931, 58 ff.; id., Philippes, 474 ff.

[12] See footnote 9, and cf. Lemerle, BCH 60, 1936, 341.

[13] I.e., "in order that a sum not less than five denarii be reserved for me." Her purpose might then be to provide for maintenance of the tomb, but the language, because it is vague, would not exclude expenditure for sacrifice.

[14] BCH 38, 1914, 52.

[15] Collart, Philippes, 484, nn. 5 and 6.

[16] Ibid., 478; cf. Nilsson, P.-W., s.v. Rosalia.

[17] Edson, 175.

BOOKS RECEIVED

L'Apoteosi di Reuchlin (Apotheosis Capnionis) di Erasmo di Roterdam. *Di Giulio Vallese.* Napoli, R. Pironti & Figli, editori, 1949. 143 p. L. 630.

How Came Our Faith. *By W. A. L. Elmslie.* N. Y. Scribner's, 1949. xii, 417 p. $3.25.

How Shall We Pay for Health Care? *By Oscar R. Ewing and George F. Lull.* [Washington] Public Affairs Committee, Inc. Pamphlet No. 152. 32 p. $.20.

Jacques Maritain, Son Oeuvre Philosophique. Revue Thomiste, T. XIVIII, nos. 1–11. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1948. xii, 342 p. no pr.

Opuscula Omnia Necnon Opera Minora. Tomus Primus: Opuscula Philosophica. *Par S. Thomas Aquinatis.* Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1949. 620 p. 1500 fr.

Paraboles et Allegories Evangeliques. La Pensee de Jesus. Les Commentaires Patristiques. *Par Jean Pirot.* Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1949. 505 p. 750 fr.

Recovery of Man. *By F. R. Barry.* N. Y., Scribner's 1949. vii, 109 p. $2.00.

Studia Hellenistica, No. 5. *Ediderunt L. Cerfaux et W. Peremans.* Lovain, Bibliotheca Universitatis Lovanii, 1948. 163 p. 11.25 guilder.

Theologie und Geschichte des Juden Christentums. *Von Hans Joachim Schoeps.* Tübingen, Mohr, 1949. 526 p. no pr.

PRINTED AT THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRINTING OFFICE
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U.S.A.

Classic literature is always modern

THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY

THE great literature of the Greeks and Romans has remained alive throughout the centuries because of the deeply satisfying pleasure it has given to each new generation of readers. The *Odyssey* of Homer, the poems of Ovid, the philosophy of Plato, the adventures of Aeneas — these are old friends of the classroom. But many other books, by both familiar and less well-known authors, provide reading as stimulating today as it was two thousand years ago. The witty dialogues of Lucian, the brilliant comedies of Aristophanes, the travels of Strabo, and the botanical discoveries of Theophrastus, founder of modern botany, are only samples of the wide range of subjects included in the LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY of over 360 titles.

In the LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY the original Greek or Latin text is printed on left-hand pages with a line-for-line translation on facing pages. Write for a descriptive catalogue. The price is uniformly $2.50 a volume.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE 38 , , , MASSACHUSETTS